

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XII, 3.

WHOLE NO. 47.

I.—SERVIUS ON THE TROPES AND FIGURES OF VERGIL.

SECOND PAPER.

Figures.

A Figure (*σχῆμα*) is a mode of expression artistically altered from the form in ordinary use.¹ The usual term in Latin after Cicero is *figura* (de opt. gen. 14), although he also uses *formae* (Brut. 69) and *lumina* (Or. 83).

Servius gives the following definition: Comm. in Don. 447, 8 K. quidquid ergo scientes facimus novitatis cupidi, quod tamen idoneorum auctorum firmatur exemplis, figura dicitur. quidquid autem ignorantes ponimus, vitium putatur, cf. A V 120 ergo metaplasmus et figura . . . discernuntur peritia et inperitia.

Although tropes and figures have much in common, since both are peculiar turns of expression wherein ordinary language is changed for the sake of greater emphasis or beauty, there yet exists a determinate difference between them (Quint. 9, 1, 5-7), viz.: a trope implies of necessity a *transfer* from one sphere of use to another, while a figure does not; although this distinction is often hard to maintain (Quint. 9, 1, 9).

Figures are commonly divided into *figurae sententiarum* (*σχήματα διαβολίας*) and *figurae verborum* or *elocutionis* (*σχήματα λέξεως* or *λόγου*).² Servius does not notice this distinction, although he uses once the term *σχῆμα διαβολίας*: A II 413 ereptae: σχ. δ.; non

¹Cf. Alex. III 11, 1 Sp., Quint. 9, 1, 4; 14.

²Cf. Alex. III 14 Sp., Quint. 9, 1, 17, Aq. Rom. RLM. 23, 5; 28, 31 H., Victorin. 228, 3 K., Don. 397, 5 K., Charis. 279, 25; 283, 16 K., Diom. 443, 6 K.

enim dicit a Troianis sublatam, sed intellegendum reliquit; and V 120 defines "lexis"—latina et perfecta elocutio.

Quintilian (9, 3, 2) makes a further division of *figurae verborum* into grammatical and rhetorical, and Fortunatianus (RLM. 126, 24 H.) includes all figures under the three classes σχήματα λέξεως, λόγου, διανοίας. It is in the sense of σχῆμα *grammaticum* that Servius commonly uses the terms *schema* and *figura*, under which are included all the peculiarities of an author's style in grammar, syntax and phraseology. But unless these peculiarities are countenanced by age, authority, custom or reason they are considered faults of style, i. e. solecisms.¹

Servius gives definitions at A V 120 inter soloecismum et schema, i. e. perfectam sermonum connexionem, figura est, quae fit contextu sermonum ratione vitiosa. ergo metaplasmus et figura media sunt et discernuntur peritia et inperitia. fiunt autem ad ornatum; cf. Comm. in Don. 443, 28; 447, 2 K. si in prosa oratione fiat hoc vitium, tunc soloecismus vocatur; in poemate schema dicitur.

QUINTILIAN'S LIST OF FIGURAE.

Quintilian (9, 3, 6 ff.) mentions a number of *figurae*, which he illustrates by examples from Vergil. I have given this list with Servius' comments on the passages, comparing also the statements of the grammarians; but as the latter are made from the point of view of *soloecismus*, they are noted only so far as they agree with Quintilian.

Quint. 9, 3, 6 fiunt ergo et circa genus figurae in nominibus. *Quint.* and *Charis.* cite G I 183 capti talpae: *Serv.* et mutavit genus; nam 'haec talpa' dicitur: sicut et de dammis fecit, ut (B VIII 28) timidi dammae: *Serv.* l. l. et dammas masculino genere posuit; sic alibi (G III 539): *Serv.* l. l. mutavit genus, ut vitaret homoeoteleuton. *Quint.* and *Charis.* also cite B VIII 28.

Other examples of a change of gender are noted at A III 286 (IX 706), IV 462, V 610, VII 247, 688, VIII 561, 641, XI 714, G II 12; cf. Comm. in Don. 446, 36 K.

Quint. 9, 3, 7—the passive used for the active and *vice versa*—*Serv.* A I 104 avertit: pro 'avertitur.' et est figura creberrima. potest namque pro activi verbi significatione passivum poni, ut est (XI 660) bellantur pro bellant . . . et contra pro passivi verbi

¹ Cf. Alex. III 11, 1 Sp., *Quint.* 9, 3, 3, Sac. 451, 1 K Don. 394, 23 K., *Charis.* 265, 8 K., *Diom.* 451, 29; 456, 1 K

significatione activum pōnitur, ut est hoc 'avertit' pro avertitur, et (II 229) et (II 8), etc.; cf. *Serv.* A I 4.

Other examples are: A II 9 (IV 251, X 804, XI 617), 234, 341, III 106, VI 800, X 240, 649, G II 425, III 507.

Quint. 9, 3, 8 est figura et in numero, vel cum singulari pluralis subiungitur, . . . vel ex diverso (B IV 62), qui non, etc. [cui *Serv.*, *Ribb.*].

Quint. 9, 3, 9 utimur et verbo pro participio (A V 248) magnum dat ferre talentum, tamquam ferendum: *Serv.*—*ut ferat.* Graecum est duo verba coniungere, ut paulo post (262) donat habere viro. sed hoc datur poetis; cf. *Don.* Ter. And. 3, 2, 4.

Other examples are: with *dare*, A I 318, X 235, 701, XII 97, 211; with a verb of saying, A VI 313, XI 463, B II 43; also A VI 501, VIII 676.

Schol. Dan. come closer to Quintilian's explanation, e. g. A X 90 *consurgere in arma: pro 'consurgendi'; infinitivus modus verbi pro participato.*

Other examples are: A I 527, II 637, III 201, IV 565, IX 736, X 277, B VIII 89, G I 21. The infinitive depending on an adjective is noted at A I 514 *avidī coniungere*, II 348, IV 563, V 108, XII 290, B V 2, 89, VII 5; on a substantive, once: A II 10 *amor casus cognoscere.*

Quint. 9, 3, 10 iunguntur interim schemata (Hor. C. I, 15, 24): Sthenelus sciens pugnae: est enim scitus pugnandi. The *figurae* in this example are *participium pro nomine* (*sciens=scitus*) and *nomen pro participio* (*pugnae=pugnandi*): examples of the former are noted at A I 234 (269, IX 7), 324, III 350 (XII 522), 589 (IV 7), IV 15, 61, 120, VI 239, cf. G III 146; VII 11, cf. G III 5; VIII 588, XII 312, cf. III 229; G IV 123; of the latter—substantives: A I 21 *late regem*, XI 94—adjectives: A I 122 *laxis: pro laxatis*, 599, IV 580, VI 484, 496, IX 486, XI 713, G I 328, cf. A II 211.

Quint. 9, 3, 11 transferuntur et tempora: . . . (praesens enim pro praeterito positum est).—*Sac.*, *Don.* and *Charis.* cite A III 3 *humo fumat Neptunia Troia: Serv.* sane quaeritur quo modo dixerit 'cecidit' et 'fumat'. sed aut per licentiam poeticam tempus pro tempore posuit, ut (II 12), aut certe naturam rerum expressit; *Serv.* l. l. propter metrum pro praesenti praeteritum posuit.

Other examples of a present tense for a past are: A I 316, II 428, 443, IV 228, V 545, X 763, XI 1 (G III 19), 577; of a past tense for a present: A V 708, VI 79, B II 34, cf. A I 619, II 12, B IX 38.

Quint. 9, 3, 11 (transferuntur) et status (A II 104): hoc Ithacus velit: *Serv.* 'Ithacus' vero pro 'Ithacensis', principale pro derivativo, cf. III 629, Comm. in Don. 446, 35 K.

Other examples are: A I 686, III 352, 401 (V 251), IV 552, 662 (XI 287), VI 52, 840, X 155, G II 88; and of the opposite form, *der. pro prin.*: A I 490, III 105, G I 184, II 170.

Quint. 9, 3, 14 alia commendatio vetustatis, cuius amator unice Vergilius fuit (A XI 406): vel cum se pavidum contra mea iurgia iactat [fingit *Serv.*, *Ribb.*], et (A I 19) progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci audierat . . . illud et in consuetudine remansit 'enimvero', his amplius apud eundem (G IV 445): nam quis te iuvenum confidentissime, quo sermonis initium fit: *Serv.* i. e. 'quisnam'. hodie enim 'nam' particula postponitur, antea praeponebatur: Terentius in Phormione (5, 1, 5): *Don.* l. l. ἀναστροφῇ, ut (G IV 445) et (A VII 787), cf. *Serv.* l. l.

Quint. 9, 3, 17 ex Graeco vero translata . . . vel Vergili (plurima) (A I 67): Tyrrhenum navigat aequor: *Serv.* figura Graeca est; nos enim dicimus per aequor navigat. similiter etiam alio loco (XII 197) terram mare sidera iuro, cum latinitas exigit, ut addatur praepositio *per*.

Other examples are: A I 524, III 191, XII 753.

Quint. 9, 3, 17 et iam vulgatum actis quoque (A XII 5): saucius pectus: *Serv.* saucium pectus habens ut (V 135), cf. I 320 nuda genu: nudum genu habens, ut si dicas 'bonus animus'. et est Graeca figura, sed non ea quam diximus fieri per participium praeteriti temporis et casum accusativum; haec enim per nomen fit: quamvis ad unam significationem recurrant.

Other examples are: A I 589, IV 559, XII 25.

The form of the figure with perf. pass. part. is noted at A I 228 oculos suffusa nitentes: nitidos oculos lacrimis perfusos habens. et est figura quae fit quotiens participio praeteriti temporis a passivo iungimus casum accusativum, ut 'deiectus animus', 'maesta vultum'.

Other examples are: A I 320, 481, 561, 579, 658, II 57, 210, 218, 221, 273, 629, III 428, IV 216, 395, 509, 589, 644, V 135 (XII 64), 511 (VI 281), 536, VI 156, IX 579, X 157, XI 35, 480, 507, 649, XII 416, 599, B I 54, VI 15, G III 230, IV 13; with pres. part. A I 492, V 97, X 324.

Quint. 9, 3, 18 ex eadem parte figurarum priore dico et adiectio est illa, quae videri potest supervacua, sed non sine gratia est (B X 11): nam neque Parnasi vobis iuga nam neque Pindi. potest enim deesse alterum 'nam'; cf. *Serv.* G IV 341 (p. 286).

Quint. 9, 3, 19 utimur vulgo et comparativis pro absolutis.—*Serv.* A I 228 tristior; comparativum posuit pro positivo.

Other examples are: A V 68, VI 304, G I 93; cf. XII 678 quicquid acerbum est morte pati; aut certe positivus sit pro comparativo, VIII 127 optime Graiugenum; superlativus est pro positivo. sic ergo dixit ut Homerus (Il. XII 832).

Quint. 9, 3, 20 sunt et illa non similia soloecismo quidem, sed tamen numerum mutantia, quae et tropis adsignari solent, ut de uno pluraliter dicamus (G II 541); sed nos immensum spatiis confecimus aequor; cf. *Serv.* A II 89 et nos; pluralis numerus pro singulari.

Other examples are: A VII 98, VIII 664, XII 367, 374, G I 100; three cases are noted as "invidiose", viz.: A II 155, X 848, XII 876; cf. II 643 ἐμφατικῶς, III 327 ad excusandum pudorem.

Quint. 9, 3, 20 et de pluribus singulariter (G III 346); haud secus ac patriis acer Romanus in armis.—The following examples are noted: A II 19, 20, 729, V 117, 403, VI 893, XI 480, XII 350, G III 498, IV 226.

Quint. 9, 3, 21 specie diversa, sed genere eadem et haec sunt (G II 298): neve tibi ad solem vergant vineta cadentem. (G III 435) ne mihi tum mollis, etc.: non enim nescio cui alii prius, nec postea sibi uni, sed omnibus praecipit.—For the first example cf. *Serv.* A VI 148 poteris: poterit quis. tertiae enim personae significationem ad secundam transtulit et generaliter loquitur, IV 401 honesta figura si rem tertiae personae in secundam referas; other examples are: A IV 491, VIII 691, XI 528. For the second example cf. *Serv.* l. l. nec mihi: nec cuicumque, cf. G I 456, II 475.

Quint. 9, 3, 22 et nostra persona utimur pro aliena, et alios pro aliis fingimus... (23) illa quoque ex eodem genere possunt videri: unum quod interpositionem vel interclusionem dicimus, Graeci παρένθεσιν, παρέμπωσιν vocant (see p. 189); cui adiciunt hyperbaton (p. 186), . . . alterum, quod est ei figurae sententiarum, quae ἀποστροφὴ dicitur.

SERVIVS' LIST OF FIGURAE.

This includes a number of *figurae* noted by Servius, many of which are mentioned by the grammarians under *soloecismus*.

A I 2 Italiam venit; ars quidem hoc exigit, ut nominibus provinciarum praepositiones addamus, civitatum nusquam. tamen plerumque perverso ordine lectum est; nam ecce hoc loco detraxit

provinciae praepositionem dicens 'Italiam venit' *pro ad Italiam venit* . . . et est figura; cf. III 154, IX 598.

DE:—A I 38 nec posse Italia avertere: detraxit more suo praepositionem provinciae; non enim dixit 'de Italia', sed 'Italia'.

IN c. Abl.:—A I 263 Italia: in Italia, cf. IV 36, 426, XII 344, B VIII 95.

IN c. Acc.:—A I 52 *Aeoliam venit: in Aeoliam*.

A I 6 inferretque deos Latio; h. e. in Latium. et est figura usitata apud Vergilium. quod enim per accusativum cum praepositione dicimus ille per dativum ponit sine praepositione, sicut alibi (V 451) it clamor caelo, pro in caelum.—About 35 cases are noted, in 20 of which IN is supplied, in 15, AD; in at least 12 instances the dative is due to a compound verb. An example of the opposite form is A I 440 per medios: figura est; nam planum fuerat 'mediis se infert'.

A I 16 hic illius arma: figura creberrima adverbium pro adverbio posuit, praesentis loci pro absentis; debere enim dicere 'illic' (I 52, 168, 247, II 29, III 97).—A I 728 hic: tunc; est ergo adverbium temporis (I 187, II 122, 199, 533, V 340, 387, X 345).—A IX 760 hinc: nec loci est, nec temporis, sed ordinis, i. e. 'deinde', cf. I 194, X 388, B VIII 67, G I 5, IV 58.—A II 18 huc: pro illuc (II 763, IX 752, G II 187).—A VI 485 etiam: adhuc (II 292, XI 352, G III 189).—A II 615 iam: praeterea (G II 57, 350), IV 157 iam: i. e. modo (X 162, B IV 43), II 103 iamdudum: modo 'quam primum' (I 580, G I 213).—A I 275 inde; *post vel* *deinde vel tunc, adverbium loci pro temporis* (II 2, VIII 587).—A I 13 longe; valde (II 711, V 406, X 754, XI 214, XII 44).—A I 388 modo: tantummodo (II 160, IV 50, VII 319).—A II 546 nequiquam: non (IV 209, XII 634, G I 192, 403).—A XI 801 nihil: non (IX 131).—A II 670 numquam: *pro 'non'* (III 450).—A I 200 penitus: i. e. valde (VI 679, IX 1).—A I 49 praeterea: postea (G IV 501).—A VI 10 procul: haud longe (III 13, V 124), cf. II 42, X 835, B VI 16.—A III 416 protinus: continuo, cf. II 437, 545, VII 601, IX 335, X 340, G I 4.—A IV 291 quando; siquidem (X 366).—A X 709 multosque: pro 'multosve', cf. II 37, IV 143; IV 498 'que' autem pro 'enim' (X 333).—A V 798 si; siquidem (V 64, G I 7, 17, 189).—A III 228 tum; praeterea (I 164), V 513 tum: *deinde* (X 445).—A I 81 ubi: *pro postquam* (714, III 410), IV 118 ubi: *pro 'cum'* (143).—A XI 259 vel: etiam (438, B VIII 69).—A I 34 vix: mox vel statim, cf. II 172, III 8, IV 545.

'EN ΔΙΑ ΔΥΟΙΝ.

This is the resolution of a complex expression into its parts—a substantive limited by another in an oblique case (hypotaxis) becoming two coördinate substantives (parataxis) united by a conjunction.¹

Servius' definition is at A I 61 *molemque et montes*: i. e. *molem montis. et est figura, ut una res in duas dividatur, metri causa interposita coniunctione, ut alio loco (G II 192) pateris libamus et auro, i. e. pateris aureis; cf. Serv. l. l., A X 754 (cf. V 68).—I III, 311, 648, II 420, V 431.*

Other examples are: A II 627 *ferro et bipennibus* (p. 285), III 148 *effigies sacrae, etc.*, 467 *hamis auroque*, cf. V 259, VII 142, IX 704, G III 56; IV 33 (*nec dulces natos*) *Veneris nec praemia* (p. 190), V 410 *caestus et arma*, VII 15 *gemitus iraeque*, IX 601 *gelu et undis*, XI 22 *socios inhumataque corpora*, 571 *equae mammis et lacte ferino*. Without designation: A III 223, VII 751, VIII 52.

ANTIPTOSIS.

This refers to the use of one grammatical case for another.² I have found the term only in the authors noted below and in Servius, who, without giving a formal definition, makes a perfectly clear statement: e. g. A I 120 *Ilionei*: *antiptosis est, pro genetivo enim dativum posuit, . . . qua plerumque utuntur poetae, ut (573) urbem quam statuo vestra est, pro 'urbs' (Serv. l. l. multi antiptosin volunt, accusativum pro nominativo; see p. 281), item (X 361) haeret pede pes, pro 'pedi' (Serv. l. l. pro 'pedi'; nam antiptosis est).*

Dat. for gen.—A I 120 (above): without designation, A I 17, VIII 209, IX 121, X 135, 137.

Acc. for nom.—A I 573 (above): A XI 775 *cassida*: pro 'cassis'; nam accusativum posuit pro nominativo; cf. *Prisc.* 218, 15 K. 'cassida' quoque accusativus est Graecus, ab eo quod est 'cassis,' quo usus est pro nominativo 'cassis' Vergilius (A XI 775), 251, 3 K., *Prob.* 28, 24 K., *Sac.* 479, 15 K., *Charis.* 103, 18 K.

Abl. for dat.—A X 361 (above): A VI 727, X 653, 845, XI 56,

¹ Cf. Porph. Hor. C. 2, 15, 18, Schol. Bern. 984 H. (citing G II 192, A III 467).

² Cf. Anon. VIII 696, 22 W., Acron. Hor. Epod. 5, 59, Don. Ter. Eun. 2, 2, 43; 4, 3, 11, Prisc. III 184, 1 K., Schol. Bern. 986 H.

G II 327: without designation, A IV 4, XI 568; cf. *Serv. in Don.* 416, 13 K., A IV 224.

Sept. cas. for gen.—A V 609 per mille coloribus arcum: aut antiptosis est 'mille colorum', h. e. multicolorum, cf. I 75 pulchra prole: notanda figura; frequenter enim hac utitur. nam quod nos per genetivum singularem dicimus, antiqui per septimum dicebant, ut hoc loco 'parentem pulchra prole', i. e. pulchrae prolis: another example is A XI 149: without designation, A I 71, 164, 313 (IV 131), 496, II 204, III 286, 538, V 401, VI 299, VII 457, IX 220, 510, X 381, G I 164, II 25, 241.

Abl. for per c. acc.—A II 771 tectis: per tecta. et est antiptosis: examples without designation, A II 205, 421, IV 404, V 673, X 38, 540, XI 142, 362, G III 292.

Nom. for voc.—A I 734 adsit laetitiae Bacchus dator: alii 'adsis' legunt, secundum quos 'Bacchus' aut antiptosis est, aut antiquus vocativus, ut (XII 192); cf. *Serv. l. l.*, VIII 77 (cf. [Serg.] explan. in Don. 498, 18 K.), XI 464.

Voc. for nom.—A II 283 expectate: antiptosis est, pro 'expectatus': another example is A VII 685: without designation, A III 382, IX 641, X 327: doubtful, A XII 176.

Voc. for acc.—A X 710 pastus: pro 'pastum', nam supra ait 'quem': ergo antiptosis est: another example is G II 160 (Schol. Bern. 986 H.), cf. A II 377.

WITHOUT DESIGNATION.

Nom. for gen.—A IV 203 *amens animi: ut (300) inops animi. sane 'amens animi' nominativum pro genetivo posuit*: other examples are: A V 73, IX 253, B VII 16.

Gen. for abl.—A IX 87 *classis egeret: pro 'classe' genetivus pro ablativo*, cf. XI 343: other examples are: A IX 682, XII 19, cf. IV 529, V 202, X 686, XI 417, G IV 490; cf. *Don. Ter. Eun.* 2, 2, 43.

Dat. for abl.—A I 145 *tridenti: autem pro tridente, dativum pro ablativo*: other examples are: A IV 2, V 129, cf. II 610; XI 351, G III 6: doubtful, A XII 511 *curru: autem aut septimus est, aut dativus casus antiquus (III 541, B V 29), cf. I 257, IX 602, G IV 158, 198.*

A I 147 *perlabitur undas: figura est. quod enim nos modo dicimus per praepositionem nomini copulatam sequente verbo, antiqui verso ordine praepositionem detractam nomini iungebant verbo, ita tamen ut esset una pars orationis, et faciebant honestam*

elocutionem. nos dicimus 'per undas labitur', illi dicebant 'perlabitur undas', item 'per forum curro' et 'percurro forum'. notandum plane quod plerumque suum regit casum, plerumque ad ablativum transit; cf. 307 cum casum suum retinet, hystero-logia est, cum autem mutat, figura est, ut (VI 2) Cumarum adlabitur oris; 'oris' pro 'oras' posuit.—Other examples are: A I 377, II 478 (723, IV 10, VII 214, XI 146, B V 5), III 292 (V 176, VI 222, VII 161, VIII 125, X 338, 371), VII 110, XII 352, 555; cf. A I 452 (et) fido et confido dativum regit, ut (IX 398). sane optima figura est quae numquam a principalitate discedit, ut (B II 29), cf. *Serv.* l. 1, VI 2.

A I 251 infandum: pro infande *posuit*, ut in VI (21) miserum. item (VII 399) torvum pro torve. et est figura quae fit quotiens nomen pro adverbio ponitur; magis autem poetica est, in prosa aut rara aut numquam.¹—Other examples are: A I 301, 415, 502 (IV 289, VII 343), II 682, IV 255, V 114, 444, VI 288, VIII 559, IX 381, 560, X 232, 272, 740, XI 583, 861, XII 338, 389, 456 (860), 477, B III 79, G I 68, III 28, 403, IV 21; see also p. 278. An example of the opposite figure is A V 489 quo: in quam; nam ponit adverbium pro nominibus, ut (I 6); other examples are: A I 671, II 150, IV 98, IX 204, B I 20, VI 23.

The following figures belong in this connection: A I 48 *Iunonis*: autem pro 'meum', nomen pro pronomine; other examples are: A I 141, 486, II 79, 293, 674, III 628, VI 381, IX 482, X 73, 826, XI 401, 566, XII 11, B III 68.—A I 253 hic: i. e. talis (II 554, IV 208, 237, IX 479, 632, XI 16, 54).—A IV 47 *quam*: *qualem vel quantam*; pronomem pro nomine, cf. XI 108, 732 (I 237, 615, 616, IV 10, VIII 427, X 670—IV 13, 14, IX 34, XI 257, 508).

A II 132 parari: infinitivus modus pro indicativo. et est figura propria historiographorum, ut Sallustius (Iug. 6, 1), cf. VIII 493.—Other examples are: A II 684, 775, III 206, 666, IV 422, VI 199, 491, 557, VII 390, VIII 215, 493, 689 (XI 142, G I 200), X 288, 289, 458, XII 216, G IV 134).

A II 427 aequi: pro 'aequitatis'. et optima figura est a feminino genere in neutrum transire.—Other examples are: A V 851, X 9, 631, G II 398.

¹ Cf. *Serv.* [Serg.] *Comm.* in Don. 438, 35; 446, 24 K. quae locutio sic hodie crebra est, ut figura putetur. nam omnes dicunt 'pulchrum legit,' 'delicatum loquitur.'

A IV 106 Libycas adverteret oras: absolutior quidem est haec lectio, sed verior. et figuratior illa est 'Libycas averteret oras' [*Ribb.*]: nam plerumque trahitur schema, ut aliquo ituri non ad locum, sed de loco ponamus significationem, ut si dicas 'de Campania abeo in Tusciam', 'abeo' honestius est quam si 'eo' dixeris. nec hoc tantum hoc loco facit, sed pluribus: hinc enim est (VI 375); cf. *Serv.* l. l.

A IX 771 (774) amicum Crethea musis (Crethea musarum comitem): et tale est schema per repetitionem, ut (X 180); cf. G IV 341.

The following passages also are noted: A VI 435 lucemque perosi: figurate dixit; nam 'perosus illius' dicimus.—A VII 445 exarsit in iras: communis sermo habet 'ardeo illa re', sed figuratius 'ardeo in illam rem' dicimus.—A IX 631 virtutem inlude: 'inludo tibi' et 'insulto tibi' dicimus; nam 'inludo te' figuratum est, ut hoc loco, item 'insulto te': Sallustius (hist. inc. 50 Kr.); cf. *Serv.* X 643, II 64.—G III 502 *figuratum est* 'resistit hanc rem' pro 'huic rei'.

Novae Elocutiones.

The following words and expressions are noted as *new*, i. e. used first by Vergil, and may therefore be mentioned in this connection.

A I 663 *aligerum*, II 62 *occumbere morti*, III 221 *caprigenum pecus*, 339 *superat*, 572 *prorumpit nubem*, IV 50 *sacris litatis*, V 53 *vota*, 144 *biuugo*, VI 353 *excussa magistro*, VII 490 *mensae erili*, VIII 268 *minores*, 433 *currum et rotas instabant*, IX 48 *maculis albis*, 641 *macte*,¹ X 216 *noctivago*, 321 *labores praebuit*,

¹ The Schol. Dan. further remark: *suam consuetudinem fecit: nam et alibi* (VII 11) *et iterum* (IV 263) *praetermisit cuius rei dives, cum veteres 'dives illius rei' dicerent, quod ipse alibi* (G II 468) *et* (A IX 26). *item cum veteres natalem diem vel locum vel tempus dicerent, ut Horatius* (C. I, 21, 10) *et Plautus in Pseudolo* (I, 2, 46), *Vergilius his omissis dixit* (B III 76) *meus est natalis*.—For *dives* cf. *Serv.* A IX 26 per genetivum frequentius utimur hac figura, quam per ablativum (I 343, II 22); with abl. VII 537 secundum antiquum morem (cf. IV 37, X 201). The statement about *natalis* Servius contradicts at B III 76 sane 'natalis' apud maiores plenum fuit, licet posteritas 'natalis dies' coeperit: nam cum Horatius dixerit (Ep. 2, 2, 210) *natalis grate numeras?* Iuvenalis ait (XII 1) *natali die*; but the true difference is probably given by Donatus (Ter. Phor. I, 1, 14): cum adiectione temporis cuiuslibet 'natalis' melius dicitur, sed Vergilius serviens personae rusticae (B III 76) *mens est natalis*, inquit nec addidit 'dies'. The omission of the word of time or circumstance was probably an idiom of the *Sermo Vulgaris*, and hence we find Horace using it in the Epistles, but the more formal expression in the Odes.

834 vulnera siccat lymphis, G I 88 exudat umor, II 308 *ruit ad caelum*, 345 *indulgentia*.

It is in favor of the mutual independence of Servius and Macrobius that not one of these innovations in syntax and diction is mentioned by Servius, the interlocutor of Macrobius (6, 6, 1-11), nor on the other hand does the Servius of the Commentary remark as new a single one of the 30 examples cited as novelties by the Servius of Macrobius (cf. Nettleship, Conington's Vergil⁴, I, p. xxx ff.). It seems quite unlikely, when we recall Macrobius' freedom in appropriating from the writings of others, that he should have taken the trouble to collect new examples, when a number already noted lay convenient for use. More probably he and Servius both took their examples from some larger collection as a common source, and either of purpose or by accident avoided choosing the same instances.

GRAECAE FIGURAE.

The following constructions and expressions of Vergil are noted by Servius as being copied or borrowed from the Greek.

A I 41 (Aiakis) Oili: et est Graeca figura, si dicamus 'Aeneas Anchisae' et subaudiamus filius. hac autem figura utimur circa patres et circa maritos tantum, ut Vergilius (VI 36) et (III 319); other examples are: A I 231, IX 358, G I 138.

A I 67 navigat aequor: fig. Gr. est; nos enim dicimus per aequor navigat; cf. p. 270.

A I 320 nuda genu: et est Gr. fig. (p. 270), cf. 228 oculos suffusa nitentes (p. 270); examples with verbs are: A I 713 expleri mentem nequit, II 407 furiata, V 720 animum diducitur, X 698 Latagum occupat os, G III 84 tremit artus.

A I 328 vox hominem sonat: Gr. fig. est.

A I 440 neque cernitur ulli: et est Graecum οὐδενὶ ὁρώμενος, ut (Hor. C. 1, 6, 1); similar examples are: A I 669 nota tibi, IV 38 pugnabis amori (cf. I 475, B V 8, G II 138), VIII 127 cui me precari, XI 126 iustitiaene prius mirer belline laborum, 280 laetor malorum (cf. I 441, XI 73, 338, 416), 383 meque timoris argue tu Drance, XII 649 indignus avorum.

A I 663 Latini deum ipsum 'Cupidinem' vocant, hoc quod facit 'amorem'. sed hic imitatus est Graecos, qui uno nomine utrumque significant; nam Amorem dixit deum, cf. 869.

A II 53 cavae cavernae: Gr. fig., ut 'vitam vivere' 'mortem mori'; cf. V 447, XII 680.

A II 111 euntes: ire cupientes, ut (B VI 3). et est Gr. fig., ubi statuisset aliquid pro inchoatione habetur; other examples are: A I 474, 656, II 117, III 581, VIII 157, XII 585, G I 193.

A II 598 Ascanius puer: filius, ut (IV 94), Horatius (C. I, 12, 25). et est Graecum, nam *παῖδας* dicunt; cf. III 339, IV 94, *Don.* Ter. And. 2, 3, 26.

A II 601 (Tyndaridis) facies invisā: i. e. Helena. et est Graecum, ut 'vis Herculeā', h. e. Hercules (p. 186).

A III 426 prima (hominis facies): nominativus est pluralis a neutro. et est Gr. fig., τὰ πρῶτα ἀνθρώπος; cf. V 285 Cressa genus, III 594 *cetera Graius*.

A III 501 Hesperia: autem Ἑσπερόθεν, nam Graece dixit, et est de loco adverbium 'Dardanus Ἑσπερόθεν'. figura enim non numquam pulchra est si elocutio imperfecta sit, ut Cicero in Verinīs (I, 8, 23); cf. IV 36 aut certe Τυρόθεν, i. e. de Tyro, ut (III 501).

A V 248 dat ferre: Graecum est duo verba coniungere, ut paulo post (262); cf. II 10 amor casus cognoscere, I 514 *avidi coniungere* (p. 269).

A VI 341 quis te Palinure deorum: 'quis deus' debuit dicere, sed graece dixit τίς θεῶν; cf. VIII 217 *una boum: fig. Gr.*

A XI 471 multaue se incusat: pro 'multum'. et est Gr. fig., cf. I 465 *multa gemens: graecum est* πολλὰ στενάζων, V 869 multa gemens: nomen pro adverbio; other examples are: A V 19, VI 467, IX 333, X 94 (G IV 122), 839 (XII 402, 496, G IV 301), XI 854, XII 398, G II 134, 275, III 500.

The Schol. Dan. remark upon a provincialism peculiar to Vergil's native district: G I 104 *comminus arva insequitur: statim, sine intermissione. non est ergo 'ex propinquo'. qui significatus frequentissimus est in cisalpina Gallia; vulgo enim dicunt 'vado ad eum, sed comminus': unde Vergilius magis patriam consuetudinem videtur secutus.*

SCHEMATA LEXEOS.

The Latin grammarians (*Don.* 397, 7 K., *Charis.* 279, 24 K., *Diom.* 443, 13 K.) give a list of *schemata lexeos* containing 17-28 names, of which Servius notices the following: prolepsis, zeugma, syllepsis, homoeoteleuton, hirmos, anacoluthon, climax.

PROLEPSIS.

This term was first applied to that method of argumentation by which the arguments of an opponent are stated and answered

before he has had a chance of presenting them himself.¹ It was afterwards extended in meaning so as to include any anticipation, whether in sense or construction.² The Latin terms are *subiectio* (Cornif.) and *praesumptio* (Quint.).

The four grammarians and *Rufinian* cite A XII 161 Interea reges, ingenti mole Latinus, etc.; *Serv.* hyperbaton (p. 187); *Rufinian* also cites B VI 30 nec tantum Rhodope mirantur et Ismarus Orphea; *Diom.* cites, to illustrate his second definition, A I 2 Laviniaque venit litora; *Serv.* 'Lavina' legendum est, non 'Lavinia', quia post adventum Aeneae Lavinium nomen accepit . . . quamvis quidam superfluo esse prolepsin velint.

The following examples illustrate Servius' use of the term:³ A I 565 quis genus Aeneadum, IV 42 lateque furentes Barcaei, VI 900 ad Caietae portum: a persona poetae prolepsis, cf. VII 712 (VI 776), G IV 461; VII 797 sacrumque Numici litus, VIII 136 *Teucros*, 347 *Tarpeiam sedem*, 361 Romanoque foro, IX 9 *Palatini*, X 120 *legio*, G II 162 *Iulia unda*.

ZEUGMA.

This occurs when a word expressed in one clause is supplied with another clause in order to complete the sense.⁴ The Latin terms are *ligatio adnexio* (Rufin.); but special terms are used according to the position of the word with reference to the related clauses—*coniunctio adiunctio* (Cornif.), *hypo- meso- pro- promeso- zeuxis* (Sac.), *meso- hypo-zeugma* (Diom.).

The four grammarians cite A III 359 qui numina Phoebi qui tripodas, Clarii laurus, qui sidera sentis: *Serv.* sane per omnia zeugma est ab inferioribus 'sentis'; cf. 360, I 120 (below), III 260; *Rufinian* cites A IX 8 urbe et sociis et classe relicta.

The clearest statement of Servius is at A I 120 iam validam Ilionei navem: zeugma est ab inferioribus 'vicit hiems'. quod fit et a superioribus et a medio, plerumque et ad utrumque respondet, ut (III 359). ecce hoc loco 'sentis' et ante dicta et sequentia

¹ Cf. Cornif. 4, 23, 33, Cic. Or. 138, Rutil. Lup. RLM. 14, 14 H., Quint. 9, 2, 16 (cf. 4, 1, 49), Sac. 456, 7 K., Don. 397, 12 K., Charis. 280, 1 K., Rufin. RLM. 48, 1 H.

² Cf. Diom. 443, 21 K.

³ Servius does not recognize the grammatical sense in which *Prolepsis* is now most commonly employed.

⁴ Cf. Zon. III 168, 23 Sp., Cornif. 4, 27, 38, Quint. 9, 3, 62, Aq. Rom. RLM. 36, 14 H., Sac. 456, 14 K., Don. 397, 15 K., Charis. 280, 9 K., Diom. 444, 4 K., Rufin. RLM. 48, 21 H.

concludit; cf. B IX I quo te Moeri pedes? an quo via ducit, in urbem?: subaudis 'ducunt', et est zeugma a posterioribus.

Other examples are: A III 133 muros optatae molior urbis Pergameamque voco; z. a superioribus, h. e. urbem, I 502 instans operi regnisque futuris; z. est ad sequentia pertinens.—A V 111 et palmae pretium victoribus; z. utriusque lateris.—A XII 436 fortunam ex aliis; subaudimus 'opta'; nec enim fortuna discitur, et est z. non integrum, cf. III 260, VIII 260, 294.

In a single instance only, viz. A II 503, does Servius fail to note the special form of *zeugma*, but the Schol. Dan. never give more than the general term: A I 144 Cymothoe simul et Triton *adnixus*, cf. XII 576; IV 131 *retia rara, plagae*, VIII 717 ludisque viae plausuque fremebant, IX 530 *certabant*, XII 316 *me sinite*.

SYLLEPSIS.

This is when a word expressed in one clause is supplied in a modified form with another.¹ It differs from *zeugma* in that the form of the word supplied varies with the syntactical conditions of each clause, while in *zeugma* the same form is supplied in every case.

The grammarians mention two² forms of *syllipsis*:

I. Cum dictio singularis plurali alligatur. II. Cum dictio pluralis singulari concluditur.

I. Cum dictio singularis plurali alligatur.—*Sac.* cites A I 212 pars et frustra secant: *figurate, ut* (IV 405) *pars grandia trudunt*, cf. II 31, V 120; *Don.*, *Charis.* and *Diom.* cite B I 81 sunt nobis mitia poma castaneae molles et pressi copia lactis.

II. Cum dictio pluralis singulari concluditur.—The four grammarians cite A I 16 hic illius arma hic currus fuit: *Serv.* (17) quotienscumque nomina pluralis et singularis numeri conectuntur, respondemus viciniore, ut ecce hoc loco currui, non armis respondet. eadem et in diversis generibus est observatio, ut magis vicino, etc., cf. 553 sociis et rege recepto: *syllipsis per numeros*, ut (16).

III. *Sac.* cites A I 393, VII 268, B II 73, no one of which is noted by Servius.

Servius' best statement is at A IX 60 nocte super media: et est bona elocutio, facta per *syllipsin*, ut si dicas 'legi nocte super media', i. e. ultra mediam noctem; nulla enim *syllipsis* est, quae

¹ Cf. Trypho III 202, 25 Sp., Porph. Hor. C. S. 25; Serm. 1, 3, 69, *Sac.* 457, 1 K., *Don.* 397, 23 K., *Charis.* 281, 4 K., *Diom.* 444, 31 K.

² *Sac.* adds a third form the statement of which is quite obscure.

non et casum mutet, et egeat subauditione, ut (285), cf. G III 115 *et est syllepsis, cum aliquid assumitur, quod dictum supra non est.*

Servius does not regard the two-fold division of the grammarians, although he mentions forms unnoted by them and recognizes a wider range for the figure: A I 583 *classem socios receptos: syl. per numeros*, IX 523 *vos o Calliope precor*, cf. 255 *vos Nise*.—With A I 212 (above) cf. II 64, III 675, VI 660, IX 636.—A X 31 (*sine pace tua atque*) *invito numine: syl. per genus est*, 672 *quid manus illa virum*, 605 *Ascanius puer*.—A I 573 *urbem quam statuo vestra est; multi antiptosis volunt* (cf. *Don. Ter. Eun.* 4, 3, 11) . . . ut sit pro '*urbs quam statuo vestra est*'. sed si sic intellegamus, '*quam*' nihilominus sequitur et syllepsis fit per casus mutationem (cf. *Don. Ter. Ad.* 5, 4, 3), G II 317 *nec semine iacto: syl. per adsumptionem casus*, A IX 285 *quodcumque pericli est* (cf. V 108).—A II 321 *ipse trahit; septima syllepsis est; 'trahit' enim licet nepotis tantum sit, tamen et superiora concludit*; cf. p. 157.

HOMOEOTELEUTON.

This is when successive words or clauses end with the same sound.¹

Sac. cites A VIII 641 *caesa iungebant foedera porca*, and *Diom.* A VI 86 *bella horrida bella*; Servius makes no comment.

All the Latin authorities distinguish *homoeoteleuton* from *homoeoptoton*, i. e. when successive words or clauses end not only with the same sound, but also the same grammatical case, but Servius does not mention the latter term, or give any example of it; moreover, he regards *homoeoteleuton* as a blemish (A IV 504 *vitiosa est enim elocutio quae habet exitus similes, licet sit casuum dissimilitudo*), the avoidance of which may serve as the reason for a change of form or case. Examples are noted at A IV 558, IX 606, XII 341, B V 38; the following cases show the avoidance of *homoeoteleuton*: A I 30, II 56, 745, III 663, V 391, VIII 435, 545, X 571, XI 112, 464, XII 781, B III 1, G III 539 (cf. B VIII 28, G I 183).

The opposite figure, *parhomoeon*, is when successive words begin with the same sound, viz. alliteration;² when the same syllable is repeated it is called *ἀντιπαρρηχον*.

¹ Cf. Zon. III 169, 3 Sp., Cornif. 4, 20, 28, Cic. Or. 35, Rutil. Lup. RLM. 19, 3 H., Quint. 9, 3, 77, Gell. 18, 8, Aq. Rom. RLM. 30, 27 H., Sac. 459, 3 K., Don. 398, 24 K., Charis. 282, 9 K., Diom. 447, 5 K.

² Cf. Cornif. 4, 12, 18, Sac. 458, 29 K., Don. 398, 20 K., Charis. 382, 7 K., Diom. 446, 30 K.

Sac. cites A III 183 casus Cassandra canebat; *Serv.* haec compositio iam vitiosa est; quae maioribus placuit, ut (82), et (V 866).

Servius notes a sequence of the same sound at A II 199 maius miseris multoque: ut (V 866) et (III 183); nam apud veteres a similibus incipere vitiosum non erat, V 866 et bene imitatus est maris stridorem 'sale saxa sonabant'.

HIRMOS.

This term, unnoticed by Volkmann and Ernesti, is applied to a series of words all in the same grammatical case depending on a verb expressed at the end of the clause.¹

The grammarians cite A VI 724 principio caelum ac terras camposque liquentes, etc.; *Serv.* (703) hirmos est hoc loco, i. e. unus sensus protentus per multos versus.

Another example is A VI 66 est autem εἰρημός, i. e. longissimum hyperbaton. The reason for using the term 'hyperbaton' is evident when the irregular sequence of the words in the passage is contrasted with the close succession of the first example.

ANACOLUTHON.

This refers to a lack of balance or correspondence in contrasted clauses.²

Sac. cites A II 13 quamquam animus meminisse horret, luctuque refugit, incipiam; *deest* 'tamen', *quia cum praeponitur* 'quamquam', *subiungi necesse est* 'tamen' (see examples below) and B VI 9 siquis tamen haec quoque siquis captus amore leget.

Servius has no formal definition, but the examples noted are perfectly clear: A II 331 subaudis 'tot', et est *av.*; nam dixit 'quot', cum non praemiserit 'tot', III 478 *av.* est, non enim praemisit 'quamquam vicina sit', cf. II 244, III 541, V 281, G I 197 (for omission of *tamen* see XI 3); V 66 prima, XI 53 *infelix nati funus*, G I 241.

CLIMAX.

This term is used of an arrangement of words or clauses in which each word occurs twice in succession, or the concluding word of the first clause is repeated as the first word of the clause

¹ Cf. *Sac.* 455, 25 K., *Don.* 398, 30 K., *Charis.* 282, 17 K., *Diom.* 447, 28 K.

² Cf. *Porph. Hor. C.* 4, 14, 20, *Don. Ter. And.* 1, 1, 67, *Sac.* 457, 23 K., *Schol. Bern.* q86 H.

following.¹ The Latin terms are *gradatio* (Cornif., Quint.) and *ascensus* (Aq. Rom.).

Diom. cites B II 63 *torva leaena lupum sequitur, lupus ipse capellam, etc.*

The only example noted is A IX 570 *Caenea Turnus Turnus Ityn: ut ait Lucilius* (S. fr. 911 Baehr.) *bonum schema est, quotiens sensus variatur in iteratione verborum, et in fine positus sequentis sit exordium, qui appellatur climax; cf. Schol. Bern. 987 H.*

SOLOECISMUS.

In its most general sense this term includes every variation from the conventional rules of syntax:² practically, however, it is concerned with prose as opposed to poetry, and *soloecismus* in the former becomes *figura* in the latter (see p. 268). The Latin terms are *inparilitas* (Sin. Cap.) and *stribiligo* (Gell., *Diom.*).

Servius' definition (Comm. in Don. 446, 2 K. *vitium factum in contextu partium orationis, ita ut singuli sermones Latini sint, sed peccet ipsa coniunctio*) avoids the mechanical difference drawn by the grammarians between *soloecismus* and *barbarismus*, and states more clearly Quintilian's distinction (I, 5, 38) that *soloecismus* inheres not in words as individuals, but in their relations to one another.³

The grammarians repeat in a perfunctory way the statement of the relationship of *soloecismus* and *figura*, and yet without any explanation proceed to illustrate many of their forms of *soloecismus* by examples from Vergil. Quintilian more consistently regards the same peculiarities as *figurae* (p. 268), and Servius never recognizes *soloecismus* in Vergil and very rarely an approach to it, e. g. *σολοικοειδής, σολοικοφανής* (cf. Schol. Bern. 985 H.); the term occurs only at A V 120 (p. 268), and 558 *it pectore summo; sic legendum, ne sit soloecismus.*

The other terms occur in the following passages: A I 176 *rapuitque in fomite flammam: paene soloecophanes est; nam cum mutationem verbum significet, ablativo usus est: etc., cf. 295, 253, VI 339, IX 441, X 387, 807, 838, Comm. in Don. 419, 30 K.;*

¹ Cf. Zon. III 166, 19 Sp., Cornif. 4, 25, 34, Cic. Or. 135, Quint. 9, 3, 55, Aq. Rom. RLM. 34, 17 H., *Diom.* 448, 12 K.

² Cf. Herodian III 85, 7 Sp., Cornif. 4, 12, 17, Cic. Part. 18, Quint. 1, 5, 51, Gell. 5, 20, 2 (definition of Sennius Capito), Sac. 449, 16 K., Don. 393, 6 K., Charis. 266, 15 K. (definition of Cominianus), 267, 23 K., *Diom.* 453, 21 K.

³ Cf. Sac. 451, 19 K., Don. 393, 10 K.

IV 355 quem: longe repetiit; et 'quem' non ad caput, sed ad Ascanium retulit; et licet excusetur, tamen *σολοικοφανής* est, cf. G II 98, A IX 87; VIII 260 angit inhaerens elisos oculos: multi 'elidens' legunt, . . . nam 'elisos' soloecophanes est.—A X 10 non est enim 'hos suavit', ne fiat *σολοικοειδής*: quamvis inveniatur huius modi figura, ut (XII 813), et Ennius (fr. 541 Baehr.) quis te persuasit?

VITIA SERMONIS.

In addition to *soloecismus* and *barbarismus* the Latin grammarians give a list of faults of style (*vitia sermonis*), of which the following are noted by Servius, although not specifically as faults: acyrologia (p. 176), cacenphaton, pleonasmus, perissologia (p. 186), tautologia, epexegesis, auxesis, ellipsis, tapinosis, cacosyntheton, amphibolia.

CACENPHATON.

This term is applied to an expression which suggests an obscene meaning by the sound of a sequence of syllables in successive words or by a single word.¹ *Aeschrologia* (Sac., Diom.) is the converse, viz. the expression of a proper sense by improper terms.

Don. and *Diom.* cite A I 193 numerum cum navibus aequet: *Serv.* cacenphaton in sermone, quod fit si 'cum' particulam 'n' littera sequatur; *Diom.* also cites VI 406 aperit ramum qui veste latebat.

Other examples are: A II 27 Dorica castra: mala est compositio ab ea syllaba incipere, qua superius finitus est sermo;² nam plerumque et cacenphaton facit, ut hoc loco, cf. III 203 caeca caligine, G II 13 glauca canentia.

A VIII 406 coniugis infusus gremio: Probus vero et Carminius propter sensum cacenphaton 'infusum' legunt, cf. Comm. in *Don.* 447, 16 K. fieri cacenphaton etiam in sensu . . . cum dicat Vergilius 'coniugis infusus gremio', et hic cacenphaton est in sensu.

PLEONASMOS.

This means the use of a greater number of words than is actually required for the expression of the thought.³

¹ Cf. Quint. 8, 3, 44, Sac. 453, 16 K., *Don.* 394, 32 K.; Ter. Ad. 2, 2, 6, Charis. 270, 26 K., *Diom.* 451, 3 K., J. Victor RLM. 433, 7 H.

² Cf. Quint. 9, 4, 41; Alf. Biese, De iteratis syllabis, Rh. Mus. Vol. 38, p. 634 ff.

³ Cf. Trypho III 198, 2 Sp., Quint. 8, 3, 53; 9, 3, 46, Aq. Rom. RLM. 36, 25 H., Sac. 454, 1 K., *Don.* 395, 3 K., Charis. 271, 1 K., *Diom.* 449, 18 K.

The grammarians cite A I 614 sic ore locuta est; *Serv.* pleonasmos. sic (IV 359) vocemque his auribus hausi (cf. *Serv.* l. l. II 524, XI 535); *Quint.* cites A IV 359 and XII 638 vidi oculos ante ipse meos.

Servius' definition is given at A I 208 voce refert: pleonasmos est, qui fit quotiens adduntur superflua, ut alibi (IV 359). Terentius (*Ad.* 3, 2, 31) his oculis egomet vidi.

Other examples are: G II 1 sidera caeli, III 501 moriturus frigidus.—Without designation: A VIII 45 solo recubans, XI 640 volvitur ille excussus humi.

TAUTOLOGIA.

This is the repetition of the same or an equivalent word.¹

Sac. (the only one of the grammarians to quote from Vergil) cites G II 192 pateris libamus et auro: *Serv.* pateris aureis; *iv* διὰ δυοῖν; and A I 505 media e testudine templi.

Servius gives his explanation in connection with A II 627 ferro et bipennibus; tautologia est (Schol. Dan. *iv* διὰ δυοῖν: note the same confusion just above), cf. XI 135 ferro bipenni: bipennis per se plenum est, et securim significat, ut (II 627).

Another example is A III 524 humilemque videmus

Italiam. Italiam primus conclamat Achates

Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant: tautologia usus est ad exprimendum adfectum navigantium, cf. IV 346.

Servius also uses several other terms as equivalents for *tautologia*, viz. τὸ αὐτό, bis idem, and iteratio (Schol. Dan. *repetitio*), examples of which are noted in the following passages: A IX 304 pellem horrentisque leonis exuvias: τὸ αὐτό dixit, h. e. bis idem, ut (III 247), XI 260 Euboicae cautes ultorque Caphereus: τὸ αὐτό est; nam, etc., G I 200, 358.—A V 21 nec nos obniti contra: κατὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ; *sufficiebat enim aut 'obniti', aut 'contra niti'*, cf. II 378 *retroque pedem repressit*. It is clear from these examples that τὸ αὐτό and 'bis idem' are equivalent terms; other examples of the latter are: A I 23, III 326, V 23, G II 25.

In regard to the terms *iteratio* and *repetitio* (at times some part of the verbs *iterare* and *repetere*) Servius follows Quintilian and the grammarians in using the former, while the Scholia of Daniel

¹ Cf. Phoibam. III 46, 12 Sp., Zon. III 165, 21 Sp., Quint. 8, 3, 51, Aq. Rom. RLM. 34, 7 H., Sac. 454, 8 K., Don. 395, 10 K., Charis. 271, 16 K., Diom. 450, 16 K.

prefer the latter term:¹ A III 480 bis haec est in Vergilio iteratio, ut hoc loco: nam cum supra 'compellat' dixerit, intulit modo 'ait'. item in quinto (547) cum praemiserit 'sic fatur', subiecit rursus 'dic ait', cf. *Serv.* l. l., XI 24, 42, 822, XII 10; IV 328 si quis mihi: bene iterat 'mihi', cf. VIII 84; IX 771 amicum Crethea musis (p. 276), XII 262 litora vestra: bona iteratio; nam supra (248) ait litoreas aves, G IV 341 Oceanitides ambae, ambae auro, pictis incinctae pellibus ambae: notanda autem figura honestissima, facta ex repetitione sermonis.—A II 394 hoc Ripheus, hoc ipse Dymas: *et repetitum 'hoc' emphasis properantium, non figura epanalepsis a quibusdam traditur*, cf. G II 350, A X 692, XI 218 (358), 221; III 639 fugite, o miseri, fugite: *repetitio autem 'fugite' (ut in re) necessaria, ut alibi (44), IV 248 Atlantis: repetitio cum emendatione et auctu*, VIII 272 *repetitio verbi ad honorem et potestatem pertinet*, 397 sane 'fuisset' in proximo *repetitum decorem addidit*.

Examples without designation are: A III 548 haud mora continuo, IV 83 absens absentem.

EPEXEGESIS.

This differs but slightly from *tautologia* and means the repetition of an idea in *different* words.² Another name is *συνωνυμία* (Quint. Aq. Rom., Sac.); the Latin term is *interpretatio* (Cornif.).

Sac. cites A I 171 magno telluris amore, optata harena, in litore; *Porph.* A III 272 effugimus scopulos Ithacae Laertia regna; at RLM. 73, 15 H. is cited A I 250 nos tua progenies: *Serv.* quod autem dixit 'tua progenies', epexegesis est, ut (46). Donatus is quoted at A XII 507 crudum transadigit costas et crates pectoris ensem: Donatus superfluum vult esse coniunctionem, ut 'et' sit epexegesis: adigit ensem per costas, i. e. pectoris crates.

Servius gives an explanation at A I 12 Tyrii tenere coloni: deest 'quam'; amant namque antiqui per epexegesin dicere quod nos interposito pronomine exprimimus. item (530), cf. *Serv.* l. l., 159, 532, III 14, 163-6 (=I 530-3), VIII 598.

¹ The distinction is not perfect, for Servius uses *repetitio* twice to *iteratio* six times, and Schol. Dan. use *iteratum* three times to *repetitio* ten times; but there appears to be no difference of meaning such as that stated by Aq. Rom. RLM. 31, 32 H. *iteratio* (παλλήλογοις)—of one word, *repetitio* (ἐπανάληψις)—of more than one word; cf. Volkmann, p. 466.

² Cf. Alex. III 30, 13 Sp., Cornif. 4, 28, 38, Quint. 8, 3, 16; 9, 3, 45, Aq. Rom. RLM. 34, 3 H., Sac. 455, 8 K., Scholl. Hor. C. 1, 3, 2; 4, 8, 31, Don. Ter. Phor. 1, 2, 85; Hec. 3, 4, 32, Schem. Dian. RLM. 73, 15 H., Schol. Bern. 984 H.

Other examples are: A I 27 iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae, 258 urbem et promissa Lavini moenia, cf. VIII 220; II 147 manicas atque arta vincla, 260 cavo robore, VI 7 ferarum tecta, II antrum inmane, VII 543 caeli convexa per auras, XI 108 quatenam vos tanto fortuna indigna, Latini, implicuit bello, XII 516 Lycia missos et Apollinis agris, B IV 26 heroum laudes et facta parentis, G I 3 quae cura boum qui cultus habendo sit pecori (Schol. Bern. 984 H.).

The term ἐπεξεργασία at A II 546 (cf. *Quint.* 8, 3, 88, *Don. Ter. Ad.* 1, 1, 7) is probably an equivalent expression.

AUXESIS.

By this an expanded statement of a thought is made through the use of parallel ideas or expressions.¹ The Latin term is *amplificatio* (Cornif.).

Only two examples are noted: A IV 569 *heia age: hoc loco per αἰγιον figuram adhortationem implevit: nam eandem rem secundo dixit 'heia age', cum 'heia' saepe 'age' significet*, cf. II 299 magis atque magis: iteratione sermonis facit augmentum; IX 702.

ELLIPSIS.

This occurs when there is omitted from a construction one or more words required by the sense.² A Latin term is *detractio* (Quint. Aq. Rom.).

Quint. cites A XI 142 Arcades ad portas ruere; *Sac.* III 340 quem tibi iam Troia; *Serv.* hemistichium nec in sensu plenum; *Don.* I 37 haec secum; *Serv.* subaudimus 'locuta est', deest enim; *Dion.* I 2 Italiam venit; *Serv.* detraxit provinciae praepositionem, etc. (p. 271), and I 3 terris iactatus et alto.

Servius' definition occurs in connection with *parenthesis*: A I 65 ellipsis autem est quotiens remotis interpositis deest aliquid, ut est (135) quos ego—post mihi non simile poena: deest enim 'adfligam', cf. 371 (p. 189).

Other examples are: A VIII 18, IX 51, 393, XI 823, XII 161 (cf. App. Crit.). The Scholia of Daniel prefer the form *eclipsis*.

Servius does not often use the technical term, but in most cases

¹ Cf. Anon. I 457, 5 Sp., Cornif. 3, 13, 23, Cic. Or. 125, Quint. 9, 3, 28, Porph. Hor. Epod. 16, 27, Epistl. 2, 1, 22, Victorin. RLM. 169, 23 H.

² Cf. Trypho III 198, 15 Sp., Quint. 8, 6, 21; 1, 5, 40, Aq. Rom. RLM. 37, 6 H., Sac. 454, 12 K., Don. 395, 11 K., Charis. 271, 4 K., Dion. 450, 19 K., Schol. Bern. 986 H.

simply supplies the word that has been omitted. The following is a summary of such passages: Ellipsis of a verb of saying is noted 14 times, of *esse*—substantive 20, auxiliary 10 times, other verbs 39 times. Substantives: ellipsis of object accusative 3 times, of acc. and infin. twice, with adjective in agreement expressed, e. g. A I 310 *convexo, scilicet spatio*, 9 times, when a limiting word 8 times. Adjectives: omitted 12 times, part. with abl. abs. 3 times.

TAPINOSIS.

This is the use of terms inadequate to the size or importance of the object described¹—the opposite of *auxesis*.

Servius' definition is word for word the same as that of *Sac.*, *Charis.* and *Diom.*: A I 118 in *gurgite vasto: tapinosis est, i. e. rei magnae humilis expositio. prudenter tamen Vergilius humilitatem sermonis epitheto sublevat, ut hoc loco 'vasto' addidit* (cf. III 197): *item cum de equo loqueretur ait* (II 19) *cavernas ingentes. Acron.* (Hor. C. 2, 1, 33) cites A I 118; *Don.* cites II 19 *Serv.* *ut diximus, epitheto levavit tapinosin, and B VI 76 Dulichias vexasse rates: Serv. per tapinosin dictum est; nam non vexavit, sed evertit; Diom. cites A I 352 multa malus simulans.*

Other examples are: A I 465 *largoque umectat flumine vultum*, II 46 *ligno*, 482 *ingentem fenestram*, III 624 (p. 192), VIII 242 *penitus patuere cavernae*, X 763 *per maxima Nerei stagna*.—Without designation, A X 483 *pellis*, XI 914 *tinguat*, XII 775 *prendere*.

CACOSYNTHETON.

This is a transgression of the laws of word-formation.² The four grammarians cite A IX 609 *versaue iuvenum terga fatigamus hasta: Serv. (606) est autem cacosyntheton et homoeotel-euton; cf. Albinus 311, 14 K. Terga hominum sunt tantum, singulariter tergum; tergus quadrupedum, pluraliter facit tergora, i. e. coria. ideo in exemplo quod grammaticus posuit vitiosa compositio est (A IX 609), quia quod hominum fuit animalibus imposuit, et est cacosyntheton.*

Servius employs the term only in the passage quoted, although

¹ Cf. Anax. I 187, 3 Sp., Quint. 8, 3, 48, Sac. 454, 15 K., Don. 395, 13 K.; Ter. Eun. 2, 2, 43, Charis. 271, 18 K., Diom. 450, 27 K.

² Cf. Lucil. IX fr. 267 Baehr., Quint. 8, 3, 59, Sac. 454, 17 K., Don. 395, 18 K., Charis. 271, 22 K., Diom. 451, 17 K.

the use of *tergum* for *tergus* is noted at A I 368, V 351, VII 94, IX 410, cf. I 211.

AMPHIBOLIA.

This refers to the possibility of an expression having more than a single meaning.¹ The Latin term is *ambiguitas* (Quint., Don.).

Quint. cites A I 477 *lora tenens tamen*: *Serv.* quamquam mortuus; *Sac.* A XII 68 *aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa alba rosa*: *Serv.* *aut ubi multa alba lilia permixta rubent rosa.*

A typical example is A I 492 *aurea subnectens exertae cingula mammae*: amphibolon est hoc loco, utrum ipsa aurea, an aurea cingula. sciendum tamen plerumque amphiboliam metri ratione dissolvi, ut (698) *aurea composuit sponda Dido*: 'aurea' si enim ad spondam referas, non stat versus, cf. *Serv.* l. l.

Other examples are: A II 31 *donum*, cf. G IV 238, A II 436, IX 107, 200, XII 5, 51; III 398 *malis Graiis* (p. 172), 711 *fessum deseris*, IV 178 *ira inritata deorum*, 371 *quae quibus anteferam*, V 439 *celsam oppugnat qui molibus urbem*, VII 637 *classica iamque sonant*, VIII 76 *semper honore meo*, 299 *non te rationis egentem*, X 21 *insignis equis*, 109 *seu fatis Italum castra obsidione tenentur*, 124 *senior cum Castore Thybris*, XI 680 *caput ingens oris hiatus*, XII 94 *Actoris Aurunci spoliū*.—Without designation, A IX 706, X 147, XI 657, 751, 769, XII 319.

From the table appended to this article, in which × indicates an agreement between Servius and the grammarian mentioned, either in the definition of the trope or figure or, more usually, in the choice of the same example in illustration, it will be apparent that in the main Servius and the grammarians agree in the definition and treatment of tropes and figures, but a few differences are worthy of special notice. The fact that there is so little in common as regards *metaphora* should not carry any great weight, because, since Servius ignores the categories of the grammarians, it is hardly surprising that in such a wilderness of examples their paths should fail to run together. Doubtless the difference is more apparent than real, for we find agreement upon the distinction between *metaphorae reciprocae*

¹ Cf. Trypho III 203, 25 Sp., Cornif. 2, 11, 16, Cic. Part. 132, de Iuv. 2, 118, Quint. 3, 6, 46; 7, 9, 1, Sac. 455, 1 K., Don. 395, 20 K., Charis. 271, 26 K., Diom. 450, 1 K. As one of the four divisions under *status legales ἀμφιβολία* (*ambiguitas*) is treated by Iul. Victor, Fortunat., Aur. Augustin., and Mart. Cap.; see RLM. index.

and *unius partis*. The solitary difference under *synecdoche* is certainly due to a confusion of terms, and the reference to *species pro genere, ab eo quod praecedit id quod sequitur*, etc., shows the influence of Quintilian. The connection between the last form of *metonymia* and *κατ' ἐξοχήν* is so close that it is strange Volkmann does not notice it. In theory Servius and the grammarians agree about *antonomasia*, although they differ somewhat in the practical application of the definition, for the latter invariably choose examples with the substantive expressed, Servius always leaves it to be understood.

The decision between *metaphora* and *κατὰχρησις* is largely a matter of individual taste or feeling—the same expression may be praised by one critic and condemned by another—so that it is not strange that we find a difference here. Servius' testimony brings strong support to Volkmann's statement of the close relationship between *antiphrasis* and *εὐφημισμός*. As far as I know, Servius is the only authority to notice a converse form of *litotes*, where *less* is to be understood than is expressed. In regard to *hypallage* Servius agrees with Acron and Donatus. Instead of *anastrophe* Servius employs the term *hysterologia*, which the grammarians and the Schol. Dan. use as equivalent to *hysteroproteron*, but the difference is rather one of degree than of kind, for both refer to an unusual or distorted order of words; the distinction does not, however, seem to have maintained itself, for *anastrophe* is still the commonly accepted term. I believe Servius is the only one to mention *hysteroproteron in sensu*, and after Gellius the first to use *exaggeratio* as a technical Latin term for *hyperbole*. *Prolepsis* Servius seems to regard as a rhetorical figure, as opposed to oratorical, the early idea, and grammatical, the present use of the term. He employs it for the most part to point out anachronisms in the names of places. To *syllipsis* he allows a wider range than do the grammarians. *Homocoteleuton* Servius considers a fault in composition, though the grammarians include it under *schemata lexeos*.

NOTE.—My collections include the following terms, the presentation of which I reserve for another occasion: barbarismus, metaplasmus (including prothesis, epenthesis, aphaeresis, syncope, apocope, ectasis, systole, diaeresis, synaeresis, synizesis, synaliphe, ecthlipsis, antithesis, antistoichon, metathesis), τὸ αἰτίον, antapodosis, ἀντικατηγορία, antistrophe, aposiopesis, apostropha,

ἀξιοπιστία, comparatio, definitio, diastole, ἐκφώνησις, emphasis, ἐπιδιόρθωσις, euphonia, hiatus, homonymia, ὑπέρθεσις, ὑπόκρισις, ὑφέν, oeconomia, paralipsis, παρέκβασις, phantasia, τὸ πρέπον, prooeconomia, prosphonesis, κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον, σωματοποιία, topothesis.

I have also collected a large amount of material consisting of glosses, definitions, synonyms, etc., which I propose to arrange in the form of a lexicon, feeling assured that the importance of Servius' authority is great enough to make the presentation of this side of his Commentary a useful contribution to Latin lexicography.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SERVIUS AND THE SCHOLIA OF DANIEL.

I. Terms used by Servius not in the Scholia of Daniel:—κατ' ἐξοχήν (p. 170), *ονοματοποιία (p. 175), acyrologia (p. 176), *aenigma (p. 178), ironia (p. 179), diasymos (p. 180), sarcasmos (p. 180), *astismos (p. 181), κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν (p. 181), κατ' εὐφημισμὸν (p. 182), *oxymorum (p. 183), perissologia (p. 186), tmesis (p. 188), *synchysis (p. 190), antiptosis (p. 273), hirmos (p. 282), cacenphaton (p. 284), *cacosyntheton (p. 288).

II. Terms used by the Scholia of Daniel not in Servius: *metalepsis (p. 177), *climax (p. 282).

III. Different terms used by Servius and the Scholia of Daniel: Servius uses *hysterologia*=*anastrophe*; Schol. Dan., *hysterologia*=*hysteropteron* (pp. 188, 190).

Servius mentions the special form of *zeugma*; Schol. Dan., only the general term (p. 280).

Servius prefers *iteratio*=*tautologia*; Schol. Dan., *repetitio* (p. 285).

Servius prefers the form *ellipsis*; Schol. Dan., *eclipsis* (p. 287).

Schol. Dan. agree more nearly with Quintilian's explanation of the figure "verbum pro participio" than Servius does (p. 269).

At A I 109 (p. 191) Schol. Dan. give an explanation different from Servius.

At A I 724 (p. 167, n. 1) Schol. Dan. agree with the grammarians against Servius.

At A II 273 (p. 270) Schol. Dan. refer to I 320 instead of I 228, cf. *Serv.* l. 1.

For parallel statements about the object of *epitheton*, cf. *Serv.* A I 178, *Schol. Dan.* I 323 (p. 174).

* Occurs once.

JOHN LEVERETT MOORE.

TABLE.

<i>Servius.</i>	<i>Quint.</i>	<i>Gell.</i>	<i>Acron.</i>	<i>Porph.</i>	<i>Aq. Rom.</i>	<i>X Sac.</i>	<i>Don.</i>	<i>Charis.</i>	<i>Dion.</i>	<i>Rufin.</i>
Trope,	X
Metaphorae, recipr. and un. partis,	X	X	X	..
Synecdoche,	X	X	X	X	X	..
Species pro genere,	X
Ab eo qu. praec. id qu. sequitur,	X
Finitus numerus pro infin.	X
Metonymia,	X	X	X	..	X	..
Exoche,	X	..	X	X
Antonomasia,	X	X	..
Epitheton, purpose of,	X	X	X	X	..
Acyrologia,	X	X	X	X	X	..
Metalepsis,	X	X	X	X	..
Allegoria,	X	X	X	X	X	..
Aenigma,	X	X
Ironia,	X	X	..	X	..
Inrisio,	X
Diasyrmos,	X	..	X	X
Sarcasmos,	X	X	..	X	..
Astismos,	X	..	X	..
Antiphrasis,	X	X	X	X	..
Ἐν φημισμός,	X
Litotes,	X	X	X
Oxymorum,	X
Hypallage,	X	X
Periphrasis,	X	X	X	X	X	..
Perissologia,	X	X	X	X	X	..
Anastrophe,	X	X	..
Tmesis,	X	X	X	X	X	..
Parenthesis,	X	..	X	X
Hysterologia,	X	X	..
Exaggeratio,	X
ἐν διὰ δύοιν,	X
Antiptosis,	X	X
Prolepsis,	X	..
Zeugma,	X	X	X	X	..
Syllepsis,	X
Hirmos,	X	X	X	X	..
Anacoluthon,	X	X
Soloecismus,	X
Cacemphaton,	X	X	..	X	..
Pleonasmos,	X	X	X	X	X	..
Ellipsis,	X	X	..	X	..
Tapinosis,	X	X	X	X	X	..
Cacosyntheton,	X	X	X	X	..
Amphibolia,	X	X

II.—ÜBER FICKS VERGLEICHENDES WÖRTERBUCH DER INDOGERMANISCHEN SPRACHEN.¹

Fick's Vergleichendes Wörterbuch tritt zum vierten Male vor das Publicum. Es erschien zuerst in dem für die Sprachwissenschaft bedeutungsvollen Jahre 1868, demselben Jahre in welchem Scherer's Buch "Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache" ans Licht trat. Damals führte es den Titel: "Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Grundsprache in ihrem Bestande vor der Völkertrennung. Ein sprachgeschichtlicher Versuch. Mit einem Vorwort von Th. Benfey." Es war ein kleiner Band von 246 Seiten, der sich dem Titel gemäss auf die Herstellung des Wortschatzes der Ursprache beschränkte. In der zweiten Auflage vom Jahre 1871 ist der Umfang auf das Vierfache der ersten Auflage angewachsen und zugleich hat das Werk den Titel erhalten, welchen es noch jetzt trägt: "Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen." Die veränderte Bezeichnung bezieht sich darauf, dass der Verf. von jetzt ab nicht nur die Ursprache, sondern die sämtlichen vorhistorischen Epochen unsres Sprachstammes, soweit sie mehr als einen einzelnen Sprachzweig umfassen, herzustellen sucht. Neben dem Wortschatze der Ursprache begegnen wir dem der gemeinsam "Arischen" (d. i. Indo-Iranischen) Periode, der Europäischen, Gräco-Italischen, Slavo-Deutschen, Litauisch-Slavischen Spracheinheit. Dazu kommt ausserdem der ursprüngliche Wortschatz einer der einzelnen Sprachgruppen, nämlich des Gemeingermanischen. Die zweite Auflage brachte ferner als "Nachwort" zwei sehr wertvolle Beigaben: eine ausführliche Untersuchung über "Wurzeln und Wurzeldeterminative"²

¹ Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen von August Fick. Vierte Auflage bearbeitet von Adalb. Bezenberger, Aug. Fick und Whitley Stokes. Erster Theil. Wortschatz der Grundsprache, der Arischen und der Westeuropäischen Spracheinheit von Aug. Fick. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht's Verlag, 1891 (xxxviii u. 580 S.). 14 m.

² Sie wird von Scherer ZGDS.³ 454 charakterisiert als "ein grossartiger Versuch, rühmend wert für immer, wenn auch die fortschreitende Wissenschaft im einzelnen vielfach darüber hinausgehen oder davon abweichen sollte."

und einen kurzen Aufsatz "Zum Stammbaum der Indogermanen." Die dritte Auflage, welche im Jahre 1874 erschien, ist so beträchtlich vermehrt, dass aus dem einen Bande der zweiten Ausgabe jetzt drei wurden (denen zwei Jahre später ein vierter Band mit dem "Nachworte" und den Indices folgte). Trotzdem aber unterscheidet sie sich von der zweiten Auflage im Ganzen genommen weniger, als diese von der ersten. Denn die Anlage des Werkes ist ziemlich unverändert festgehalten, nur ein kurzer Abschnitt "Zum Pruso-Lettischen Wortschatz" trat als Anhang zur Letto-Slavischen Spracheinheit hinzu. Die Änderungen betreffen mehr die äussere Einrichtung des Buches und die Behandlung einzelner Abschnitte. Zunächst waren in der zweiten Auflage innerhalb einer jeden Spracheinheit in der Regel nur diejenigen Sprachen durch Belege vertreten, welche zu dieser speciellen Spracheinheit gehörten; es wurden also z. B. in der Arischen (Indo-Iranischen) Spracheinheit unter jeder Grundform nur das Indische und Iranische Wort angeführt und bei Worten, die sich auch in andren Sprachen finden, auf die Ursprache verwiesen. In der dritten Auflage sind statt solcher Verweise kurz die entsprechenden Wörter aus den übrigen Sprachen angeführt.¹ Sodann sind in der dritten Auflage mehrere Partien, die in der zweiten nur kurz, so zu sagen als Anhänge zu andren Abschnitten behandelt waren, vollständig und mehr unabhängig dargestellt. Die Europäische Spracheinheit z. B. enthielt in der zweiten Auflage nur solche Wörter, welche sich entweder ausschliesslich in den Europäischen Sprachen finden oder in ihnen irgendwelche

¹ Z. B. der Artikel, welcher das Wort für 100 im Indo-Iranischen enthält, lautet in der 2. Auflage:

çata n. hundert=ig. kanta, von dakan.

Sskr. çata n. m. hundert + zend. çata hundert.

In der 3. Aufl. finden wir dafür:

(Von çan=daçan zehen):

çata n. hundert.

Sskr. çata n. m. hundert + zend. çata n. hundert. Vgl. ἑκατόν, διακόσιοι. lat. centu-m. altirisch cét, brit. cant. lit. szimta-s. ksl. sūto n. goth. hunda- n., nhd. Hund-ert.

Die 4. Aufl. schliesst sich in dieser Beziehung im wesentlichen der 3. an. Ich für mein Teil bin geneigt, dem früheren Brauche den Vorzug zu geben, da er mir am kürzesten und am klarsten das worauf es ankommt zu sagen scheint. Freilich macht die jetzige Weise es dem Leser bequemer und wird daher wol den meisten besser gefallen.

besondren Merkmale (nach Form oder Bedeutung) gegenüber den Asiatischen Sprachen aufweisen. Der ganze Abschnitt liess sich von diesem Gesichtspunkte aus auf 86 Seiten behandeln. In der dritten Auflage dagegen ist der Versuch gemacht, den gemeinsam Europäischen Wortschatz vollständig herzustellen, auch wo die Europäische Grundform von der ursprachlichen nicht abweicht. Der Abschnitt hat in Folge dessen (und indem zugleich neben den Belegen aus den Europäischen Sprachen auch die zugehörigen Wörter der Asiatischen Sprachen zum Vergleiche angeführt wurden) etwa den sechsfachen Umfang (484 Seiten) erhalten. Eine ähnliche Erweiterung zeigen der Gräco-Italische und der Slavo-Deutsche Teil. Charakteristisch für die dritte Auflage ist ausserdem die eingehendere Berücksichtigung des Keltischen, wobei dem Werke Windisch's Bearbeitung der Keltischen Etymologien in der 4. Auflage von G. Curtius' Grundzügen der Griechischen Etymologie zu Gute kamen. Dass ausserdem alle Teile des Wörterbuches neu durchgearbeitet, im Einzelnen verbessert und um viele neue Etymologien vermehrt waren, braucht nicht als besonderes Merkmal der dritten Auflage angeführt zu werden, denn es ist ein gemeinsames Merkmal aller neuen Auflagen von Fick's Wörterbuch.

Ehe ich mich zu der vierten Auflage wende, werden einige Bemerkungen über das Werk im Ganzen und seine Stellung innerhalb der etymologischen Literatur am Platze sein: um so mehr als Ziel und Eigenart des Fickschen Wörterbuches, so vielen Beifall das Werk auch gefunden hat, doch schwerlich allgemein verstanden und gewürdigt sind.

Fick's Wörterbuch steht zu den früheren etymologischen Werken (von Pott, Bensley, Bopp, Curtius) in ähnlichem Verhältnis, wie Schleichers Compendium zu den früheren Darstellungen der vergleichenden Grammatik. Ja bis zu einem gewissen Grade lässt sich Fick's Wörterbuch geradezu als ein Versuch ansehen, der Etymologie denselben Dienst zu leisten, welchen Schleicher sieben Jahre früher der Laut- und Formenlehre erwiesen hatte. Das Charakteristische beider Werke liegt vor allem in der Reconstruction der Ursprache, oder, wie wir auch sagen könnten, in der Anwendung der historischen Methode auf vorhistorische Epochen. Die hohen Verdienste, welche Schleicher sich in dieser Hinsicht erworben hat, wurden zu seiner Zeit nur von wenigen verstanden. Man glaubte vielfach die reconstruierten

Formen als fragwürdiges Beiwerk neben den sonstigen Vorzügen seines Compendiums hinnehmen zu müssen. Erst jetzt beginnt man in weiteren Kreisen einzusehen, dass in Schl.'s Herstellung der Ursprache mehr als in irgend einer andern Seite die Stärke seines Werkes liegt.

Die Einführung des reconstruierenden Verfahrens in die Grammatik musste über kurz oder lang mit einer gewissen Notwendigkeit dahin führen, die Etymologie in entsprechender Weise zu reformieren. Schl. selbst hat in seinem Compendium schon ursprachliche Worte reconstruiert und hat auch, wie man weiss, im 5. Bande der von ihm und Kuhn herausgegebenen Beiträge sich daran gewagt, eine Fabel in der Ursprache zu schreiben. Im übrigen aber lag die Etymologie seinen Interessen ferner.¹ Auch geht der Gedanke, auf etymologischem Wege die gesamte Ursprache wieder zu gewinnen, beträchtlich hinaus über die Ansichten Schleichers, der nur an einen "geringen Vorrat an halbweges sicher zu erschliessenden Worten" (KB. 5, 206) glaubte. So blieb es Fick vorbehalten, zum ersten Male den Versuch einer consequenten und vollständigen Wiederherstellung des Wortschatzes der Ursprache zu machen.

In diesem Sinne nennt sich, wenn ich die Sache richtig ansehe, Fick's Buch in der ersten und zweiten Auflage einen "sprachgeschichtlichen" Versuch und in der dritten Auflage ein "sprachgeschichtlich" angeordnetes Wörterbuch. Am Schlusse der Vorrede der neuen Auflage bemerkt der Verf. ausdrücklich, seine Arbeit sei zu dem Zwecke unternommen: "durch die Vorgeschichte der Sprachen die Vorgeschichte der Völker unseres Stammes aufzuhellen und damit einen Beitrag zur Geschichte der Menschheit zu liefern."

Will man sich den Fortschritt vergegenwärtigen, welcher in dieser Behandlung der Etymologie liegt, so vergleiche man Fick's Wörterbuch etwa mit Pott's Wurzelwörterbuch, das in den Jahren 1867-1873, also ungefähr gleichzeitig mit der 1. und 2. Auflage des Fickschen Werkes erschien. Wir haben bei Pott das Gefühl, durch ein mit einer verwirrenden Masse von Funden vollgepfropft Museum geführt zu werden. Wir betrachten die merkwürdigen und lehrreichen Gegenstände zusammen mit dem vielen, was des Aufbewahrens nicht wert scheint, bis wir müde sind und uns

¹ Vgl. Schleicher's eigenes Geständnis in der Vorrede zu J. Schmidt, *Die Wurzel AK* (Weimar, 1865) sowie z. B. Delbrück Einl. in d. vergl. Sprachw.¹ S. 47.

abwenden mit dem Bewusstsein, zu viel gesehen und doch keine Anschauung gewonnen, kein Ganzes erblickt zu haben. Dem gegenüber macht Fick's Werk den Eindruck einer planvoll angelegten, in mässigen Grenzen gehaltenen und übersichtlich geordneten Sammlung, die uns eine bestimmte Periode unsrer Geschichte auf Grund dessen, was sich von ihr erhalten hat, veranschaulichen will, und damit eine vergangene Culturepoche vor unsrem geistigen Auge neu erstehen lässt.

Aber, wird man vielleicht einwenden, leistet denn nicht ein Werk wie etwa Curtius' Griechische Etymologie im wesentlichen dieselben Dienste? Und hat es nicht dazu den Vorzug, sich von Grundformen fern zu halten, die doch zum Teil vielleicht nicht sicher stehen und jedenfalls sämmtlich nicht überliefert sondern nur gemutmasst sind? Ich möchte dem gegenüber Folgendes hervorheben. Plan und Ziel der beiden Werke sind, wenn sie sich auch in ihrem Materiale vielfach mit einander berühren, doch so verschieden, dass sie sich kaum mit einander vergleichen lassen. Am ehesten könnte man noch Curtius' Grundzügen den Gräco-Italischen Teil der 3. Aufl. von Fick's Wörterbuch zur Seite stellen; aber auch hier springt sogleich der principielle Unterschied in dem Standpunkte beider in die Augen. Curtius' Grundzüge der Griech. Etymologie haben manche lobenswerte Eigenschaften und sind unsrer Wissenschaft entschieden zu Gute gekommen. Jedoch begnügt sich ihr Verf. im wesentlichen damit, festzustellen, welche Wortgruppen das Griechische mit den verwanten Sprachen gemein hat und womöglich zu ermitteln, welche Wurzel einer jeden Gruppe zu Grunde liegt. Grundformen sind öfter angesetzt (z. B. in der 5. Aufl., Nr. 67b, 76, 190, 193, 285, 438, 471, 498, 572 u. s.), aber doch nur ausnahmsweise und beiläufig. Die Anschauung, dass die verschiedenen Sprachen unsres Stammes nur Umbildungen einer bis ins Einzelne fest ausgebildeten Sprache sind, tritt noch zurück hinter dem allgemeinen Begriffe der Verwandtschaft und dem Bestreben, den Uranfang der griechischen Worte aufzudecken. Wir bekommen etwa den Eindruck, als liege jenseit des historischen Griechisch ein grosser ungeordneter Vorrat von Wurzeln mit einfacher Grundbedeutung, sowie von Wurzeldeterminativen, Suffixen und Flexionsendungen, aus dem die Griechische Sprache ihren Bedarf an Worten zusammen mit den verwanten Sprachen gedeckt habe und zwar so, dass zuweilen alle nach gleichen oder wenigstens sehr ähnlichen Stücken griffen. Bei Fick dagegen liegt der

Schwerpunkt gerade in dem Bestreben, die einzelnen Sprachen als Nachkommen einer fertigen, in sich abgeschlossenen Sprache zu begreifen. Statt nach dem Ursprunge der Worte und Wurzeln fragt Fick zunächst nach ihrem Aussehen in der Ursprache. Erst auf dem von Fick eingeschlagenen Wege wird es möglich, auf etymologischem Gebiete den wichtigen Unterschied zwischen "ursprachlich" und "ursprünglich" durchzuführen, und nur auf diesem Wege lässt sich die Etymologie für die Sprachgeschichte der vorgeschichtlichen Zeit wirklich fruchtbar machen.

Verweilen wir noch einen Augenblick bei dem anderen Einwande, dass die Grundformen unsicher seien und dass ihnen keine Realität zukomme. Er verdient um so mehr berücksichtigt zu werden, als wir ihm auch bei namhaften Sprachforschern begegnen.¹ Man ist soweit gegangen Schleichers Versuch, zusammenhängende Sätze in der Ursprache zu bilden, für einen Scherz zu erklären, und den Grundformen denselben Wert beizumessen, wie ihn "etwa Curven oder ähnliche Veranschaulichungsmittel für die Statistik" haben. Ich möchte den Wert der Grundformen für die historische Sprachforschung lieber mit dem Werte vergleichen, welchen historische Karten für die politische Geschichte, oder Grundrisse einst vorhandener Gebäude für die Geschichte der Baukunst haben. Die Darstellungsmittel der Statistik lassen sich nicht zum Vergleiche heranziehen, weil sie dazu dienen eine *allgemeine Theorie* zu veranschaulichen, während die reconstruierende Sprachforschung *einmalige*, individuelle *Tatsachen* zu ermitteln sucht. Der skeptische Standpunkt gegenüber den Grundformen erklärt sich wol namentlich daraus, dass die Ursprache für uns jetzt ein erheblich anderes Aussehen hat, als sie es für Schleicher hatte. Aber zeigen nicht auch etwa die Quellen des Nil oder die Nordpolarländer auf unsren jetzigen geographischen Karten ein andres Aussehen als vor nicht allzu langer Zeit? Und wird jemand deshalb behaupten, die Karten seien überhaupt ein blosses Mittel der Forschung und Veranschaulichung und wollten nicht besagen, dass die auf ihnen dargestellten Flüsse, Länder u. s. w. wirklich so existierten. Wir können in den Grundformen natürlich nichts als unsre Ansicht von der Beschaffenheit einer ehemaligen Sprachschicht geben. Jeder Fortschritt unsrer Ansichten wird sich in den reconstruierten Grundformen

¹ J. Schmidt *Verwandschaftsverhältnisse*, S. 30 f.; Delbrück *Einleitung*¹, S. 52. Beide Gelehrten erkennen übrigens den Wert der Grundformen als Ausdruck des jeweiligen Standes der Forschung ausdrücklich an.

wiederspiegeln. Aber die Ursprache ist darum keine tote Formel oder ein leerer Schatten. Sie ist ein Bild wirklichen Lebens, oder wenigstens: sie strebt dem Ziele zu, ein getreues Bild ehemaliger Wirklichkeit zu entwerfen.

Wenn die reconstruierende Etymologie die Indogermanische Ursprache in ihrer reinen Gestalt herzustellen sucht, so denkt sie dabei zunächst nicht an andre Wissensgebiete sondern an sich selbst. Die Ursprache hat als solche einen selbständigen Wert für uns, da sie ein wichtiges Stück unsrer ehemaligen Geschichte, also ein Teil unsrer geistigen Individualität ist. Ein Gewinn aber ergibt sich dabei auch für andre Wissenschaften, insbesondere für die mit der Etymologie eng verbundene Grammatik und für die Culturgeschichte. Vom Standpunkte des Grammatikers aus fällt die reconstruierende Etymologie nahezu mit der Lehre von der Wortbildung der Ursprache zusammen. Die Wortbildungslehre und die Formenlehre enthalten zugleich das Material in sich, welches Lautlehre¹ und Bedeutungslehre je nach ihren besonderen Gesichtspunkten bearbeiten. So angesehen bildet die Etymologie das unentbehrliche Seitenstück, ja bis zu einem gewissen Grade die Grundlage der Grammatik.² Der Culturhistoriker fasst den Wortschatz der Ursprache als Ausdruck des Culturstandes unsrer

¹ Delbrück Einleitung¹, S. 47, bemerkt mit Recht, dass "einleuchtende Etymologien das Material sind, aus dem die Lautgesetze gezogen werden."

² Auf Grund des von Fick erschlossenen Wortschatzes sprach sich Benfey in seinem Vorworte zu 1. Aufl. folgendermassen über den grammatischen Charakter der Ursprache aus: "Fassen wir zunächst die Wortformen ins Auge so ergibt sich, dass schon damals so ziemlich alle Themenbildungen bestanden, welche in den alten Zweigen des Indogermanischen Sprachstamms erscheinen: ihre primitiven und derivierten Verba, ihre primären und secundären Nomina, Femininal- und Neutralmotion, Gradation, Pronomina, Partikeln, Interjectionen und selbst nominale wie verbale Zusammensetzung. Ergänzen wir dieses Ergebnis durch die Resultate der vergleichenden Grammatik, welche in gleicher Weise die Existenz der Wortbeugung vor der Separation festgestellt hat, so sieht man, dass die Indogermanische Sprache zu dieser Zeit schon wesentlich vollendet war, dass nach der Trennung nichts eigentlich neues hinzutreten ist, sondern nur in einem oder andern Fall—wie z. B. zur Bildung der Kategorie der Adverbia—eine kategorische, oder überhaupt neue Verwendung der schon aus der gemeinschaftlichen Heimat mitgebrachten Mittel."—Überhaupt gewinnt seitdem die Überzeugung, dass die Ursprache voll ausgebildet war, nur Worte, keine losen Wurzeln und Suffixe kannte, immer weiteren Boden. Z. B. tritt zwei Jahre später Joh. Schmidt, Vocalismus I, S. 5 ff., nachdrücklich für diese Anschauung ein.

Urahn. Glauben und Sage, Recht und Sitte, Kunstfertigkeit und Lebensgewohnheiten eines Volkes prägen sich ab in seiner Sprache; das Wort wahr, der Münze gleich, ihren Stempel. Da culturhistorische Fragen immer auf lebhafteres Interesse in weiteren Kreisen rechnen können als rein sprachliche Probleme, so ist es nicht zu verwundern, dass die prähistorische Culturgeschichte unsres Stammes eher in Angriff genommen ist als die prähistorische Sprachgeschichte. A. Kuhn hat bekanntlich schon im J. 1845 in seinem Aufsatz "Zur ältesten Geschichte der Indogerm. Völker" den Culturzustand des Urvolkes auf Grund der Sprache festzustellen gesucht. Andre sind ihm gefolgt. Diese Arbeiten werden dazu beigetragen haben, den Gedanken einer Wiederherstellung der Ursprache zu zeitigen. Umgekehrt ist ihnen die zunehmende Sicherheit in der Methode der sprachlichen Reconstruction zu Gute gekommen.¹

Es ist bisher nur von der Reconstruction der "Ursprache" die Rede gewesen. Aber Fick hat sich nicht damit begnügt, den Wortschatz der Ursprache zu erschliessen, sondern hat von der zweiten Auflage ab auch die Zwischenstufen zu reconstituieren versucht, welche zwischen der Ursprache und dem Beginne der einzelnen Sprachen liegen. Fick hatte hierin keinen Vorgänger. Zwar hat Schleicher ähnliche Zwischenstufen für den Stammbaum der Indogermanen angenommen. Aber Schl. hat noch nicht versucht, sie im Einzelnen wieder zu gewinnen. Wer den Untersuchungen über die Verwandschaftsverhältnisse der Indogerm. Sprachen gefolgt ist, dem braucht nicht gesagt zu werden, dass nicht alle diese Spracheinheiten gleich sicher stehen. Fick hat in der neuen Auflage nicht nur die viel umstrittene Gräco-Italische Einheit, sondern auch die eine Zeit lang nahezu allgemein gebilligte Europäische, sowie die Slavo-Deutsche Spracheinheit wieder fallen lassen. Ich halte es auch nicht für sicher, dass die Westeuropäische Periode, welche jetzt zuerst in der neuen Auflage auftritt, sich in dem Sinne, welchen Fick ihr beilegt, wird aufrecht erhalten lassen. Aber unbestritten stehen neben der Ursprache die Indo-Iranische, Slavolettische und Germanische Spracheinheit da, und ich glaube dass sie uns reichlich für das entschädigen,

¹ Fick selbst hat in seiner Schrift "Die Spracheinheit der Indogermanen Europa's" einen interessanten Beitrag zu diesen Forschungen geliefert.— Eine dankenswerte Übersicht aller wichtigeren Arbeiten auf dem Gebiete der linguistischen Paläontologie gibt O. Schrader's bekanntes Buch "Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte."

was wir etwa an anderen Reconstructionen aufzugeben haben. Mögen diese Teile im Einzelnen noch mancher Berichtigung und Ergänzung bedürfen, wie ja der Verf. selbst an ihrer Umbildung und Ausgestaltung unablässig gearbeitet hat: als Ganzes bilden sie eine bleibende und hochbedeutende Errungenschaft unsrer Wissenschaft und legen Zeugnis ab für die geniale Gestaltungskraft ihres Urhebers. Es gehörte die völlige Hingabe an den Gegenstand und die Verbindung von klarem, nüchternen Denken mit lebhafter, schöpferischer Phantasie, welche Fick's Forschungen charakterisieren,¹ dazu, den kühnen Gedanken einer Wiederherstellung dieser proethnischen Spracheinheiten zu fassen und auszuführen. Die Etymologie ist dadurch, und zwar ausschliesslich durch Fick's Verdienst, der Grammatik ein gutes Stück vorausgeeilt und nur langsam folgt letztere nach. Wir besitzen noch keine Indoiranische und Lettoslavische Grammatik. Zu einer Urgermanischen Grammatik² ist kürzlich in Noreen's "Utkast till Föreläsningar i Urgermansk Judlära" (Upsala, 1890) und in der "Vorgeschichte der Altgerm. Dialekte" in Paul's Grundriss ein

¹ Es ist derselbe Boden, auf welchem z. B. Fick's Aeolischer Homer erwachsen ist. Da Homer zur klassischen Philologie hinüberführt, so möchte ich hier noch eine auf diese sich beziehende Bemerkung einrücken. Ich glaube wahrzunehmen, dass die klassische Philologie jetzt von ihren internen Gesichtspunkten und Bedürfnissen aus dazu gelangt, die Methode der sprachlichen Reconstruction bei sich einzuführen. Ich habe hierbei besonders Bücheler's "Lexicon Italicum" (Bonn, 1881) im Auge, in welchem der interessante Versuch gemacht ist, den Uritalischen Wortschatz wieder herzustellen. Die Principien, nach welchen B. verfährt, stimmen mit denjenigen Fick's zwar nicht genau überein. B. reconstruiert nur von unten auf und schreibt dem Uritalischen nur diejenigen Worte zu, welche sich sowohl im Lateinischen wie im Umbrisch-Sabellischen erhalten haben, während Fick auch solche Worte aufnehmen würde, welche nur in einem der beiden Zweige erhalten sind, aber durch das Zeugnis des verwanten Sprachen als alt erwiesen werden. Auf diesen Unterschied aber kommt es weniger an, als darauf, dass B. die Uritalischen Sprachformen von seinem Standpunkte aus in umfassender Weise und ganz consequent herstellt.

² Eine grammatische Wiederherstellung der Germanischen Ursprache forderte Scherer schon im J. 1870 in der Vorrede zu dem neuen Abdrucke von Grimm's Grammatik (I, p. xxvii). Es heisst dort: "Eine wirkliche Neubearbeitung wird wohl ohnedies einen anderen und kürzeren Weg einschlagen müssen. Sie wird, indem sie die Germanische Grundsprache umfassend reconstruiert, die Belege, die durch alle Germanischen Sprachen in gleicher Weise durchgehen, nur einmal aufführen und so die Änderungen anschaulich machen, welche der ursprüngliche Germanische Sprachstoff in den besonderen Germanischen Sprachen erlebt hat."

Anfang gemacht. Aber in beiden Darstellungen ist die Reconstruction nicht so systematisch und umfassend durchgeführt, wie in Fick's Wörterbuch, so dass eine Grammatik des Urgermanischen, die wirklich ein Seitenstück zu Fick's Urgermanischem Wortschatze bildete, auch jetzt noch aussteht.

Das Thema der Reconstruction ist hiermit zwar bei weitem noch nicht erschöpft. Aber vielleicht können auch diese kurzen Bemerkungen dazu beitragen, dass gerade diese Seite des Fick'schen Werkes richtiger verstanden und besser gewürdigt wird. Eines anderen, allgemeiner bekannten Vorzuges des Werkes sei noch kürzer gedacht: ich meine der Fülle neuer Resultate, mit welchen es die etymologische Wissenschaft im Einzelnen bereichert hat. Fick besitzt einen ganz eigenartigen Spürsinn für die Auffindung von Etymologien und sein Wörterbuch hat in dieser Beziehung nicht nur Curtius' Griechische Etymologie weit hinter sich gelassen, sondern es kommt ihm darin überhaupt kein andres etymologisches Werk der Gegenwart gleich. Was uns überrascht ist nicht sowohl die Anzahl neuer Etymologien an sich, als die grosse Menge evident richtiger Vergleichen, die uns unwillkürlich die Frage entlocken: wie ist es möglich, dass man auf diese so nahe liegende Zusammenstellung bisher nicht gekommen ist? Man würde irren, wenn man annähme, dass eine bloss e eingehende Kenntnis des Wortschatzes der verglichenen Sprachen ausreiche, um solche Resultate zu gewinnen, oder dass es sich bei Fick etwa um eingehendere Heranziehung solcher Gebiete des Indogermanischen handle, die weniger allgemein als etwa Sanskrit, Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch bekannt sind. Fick hat z. B. das Armenische in seinem Wörterbuche nur wenig, das Albanesische fast garnicht berücksichtigt; und ich glaube, er wird keinen Anspruch erheben, etwa mit dem Slavolettischen oder Keltischen genauer vertraut zu sein, als die Spezialisten auf diesen Gebieten. Eher liesse sich sagen, die neuen Etymologien beruhen auf einer gleichmässigen und sicheren Kenntnis des Wortschatzes mehrerer der wichtigsten Sprachen unsres Stammes. Aber auch dies trifft den eigentlichen Kernpunkt nicht. Kenntnisse bilden immer nur die Voraussetzung, nicht den Grund und das Wesen (oder, wenn man will, die Methode) der Forschung. Für letztere sind vielmehr teils das Ziel, teils Begabung und Charakter des Forschers massgebend. Die neuen Vergleichen beruhen bei Fick auf derselben Geistesrichtung, wie die Herstellung vergangener Sprachperioden: auf dem liebevollen, nach-

fühlenden Zurückversetzen in die Vergangenheit, wobei das, was in der Gegenwart neben einander, ohne rechten Zusammenhang und halb abgestorben vorhanden ist, unter dem Gesichtspunkte ehemaliger Einheit volles, kräftiges Leben wiedergewinnt. Man möchte sagen, es handle sich bei Fick stets darum, für die Teile, welche wir in der Hand haben, das bedeutungsvolle geistige Band in der Vergangenheit zu finden. Wer in der Lage ist, Fick's wissenschaftliches Wirken auf Grund seiner gedruckten Arbeiten im Zusammenhange und unbefangen zu überblicken, dem kann dieser Untergrund aller Forschungen Fick's kaum entgehen. Deutlicher wird er noch für jeden hervortreten, dem es vergönnt war, persönlich an seinen geistigen Interessen Teil zu nehmen und in seiner Werkstätte mit ihm zu arbeiten. Denn diese Richtung von Fick's Wesen hat eine anziehende Kraft und hat seine näheren Schüler und Freunde befähigt, sich an der etymologischen Arbeit zu beteiligen. Jeder von ihnen wird dabei den Eindruck gewonnen haben, dass der grosse Meister der Etymologie ihn nicht nur auf Augenblicke in seinen Kreis gebannt, sondern eine Anschauungsweise und eine Methode der Forschung auf ihn übertragen hat, die ihm dauernd—und nicht allein in Fragen der Etymologie—zu Gute kommt.

Ich gehe nunmehr zu der jetzt vorliegenden vierten Auflage des Werkes über, um anzugeben, worin sie sich von ihren Vorgängerinnen unterscheidet. Sie erscheint unter Mitwirkung von A. Bezenberger und Whitley Stokes. Inwiefern Stokes an der neuen Auflage Teil nimmt, würden wir leicht erraten, auch wenn es nicht in der Vorrede bemerkt wäre: er wird zum ersten Male den Urkeltischen Wortschatz reconstruieren. Wir dürfen diesem Teile der neuen Auflage mit ganz besonderem Interesse entgegensehen, zumal Stokes' Name dafür bürgt, dass die Bearbeitung mit intimster Kenntnis der Keltischen Sprachen und in echt historischem Sinne wird unternommen werden.¹ Bezenbergers Teil-

¹ Stokes hat sein Interesse für Reconstruction schon in seiner höchst dankenswerten Darstellung der Keltischen Declination in den Transactions der Philol. Soc. für 1885 (abgedr. Bezenb. Beitr. II, 64 ff.) dargetan. Es zeigt auch diese Arbeit wieder, was ich oben S. 301 bei Gelegenheit von Bücheler's Lexicon Ital. bemerkt habe: dass wir zu dem Zeitpunkte gekommen sind, wo auch die Philologie der einzelnen Sprachgebiete zur Methode der Reconstruction gedrängt wird. Diese ist eben überall da unentbehrlich, wo wir verschiedene ursprünglich zusammengehörige Dialekte neben einander haben.

nahme an dem Wörterbuche geht schon auf die dritte Auflage zurück, wenigstens insofern, als B. damals dem Wortschatze der Germanischen Spracheinheit ein Begleitwort beifügte und als B.'s Schrift über die Gotische A-Reihe (wie wir aus jenem Begleitworte entnehmen) in enger Beziehung zu dem Germanischen Teile von Fick's Wörterbuch steht. B. hat ferner im 6. Bde. seiner Beiträge gemeinschaftlich mit Fick eine reichhaltige Nachlese zum Wörterbuche veröffentlicht. Aus dem Vorworte der neuen Auflage ersehen wir, dass Fick in ihr die Bearbeitung des Slavollettischen und Germanischen Wortschatzes an Bezenberger abgetreten hat. Da letzterer den Nordeuropäischen Sprachen von jeher besondere Aufmerksamkeit gewidmet und z. B. in seinem Buche "Zur Geschichte der Litauischen Sprache" das wichtige Gebiet des Altlitauischen in grammatischer wie in etymologischer Beziehung zuerst in weiterem Umfange zugänglich gemacht hat, so dürfen wir uns auch von seinem Anteile an der neuen Auflage viel versprechen.

Einstweilen liegt uns nur der erste Band vor, der ausschliesslich von Fick bearbeitet ist. Er bringt den Wortschatz der Ursprache, der Arischen und der Westeuropäischen Spracheinheit, entspricht also dem ersten Bande und einem Teile des zweiten Bandes des vorigen Auflage; denn die "Westeuropäische Spracheinheit" ersetzt die Europäische und die Gräco-Italische Spracheinheit der vorigen Bearbeitung. Auch abgesehen von dieser letzteren tiefgreifenden Umgestaltung zeigen die einzelnen Teile ein gegen früher so verändertes Gesicht, dass man sie kaum wiedererkennen wird.

Zunächst versteht sich, dass bei der Ansetzung der Lautform der ursprachlichen Worte die Resultate verwertet sind, welche die vergl. Lautforschung seit dem Erscheinen der vorigen Auflage gewonnen hat. Gehört doch Fick zu den Mitbegründern der neuen Auffassung der Gutturale und des Vocalismus.¹ Vergleicht man den ursprachlichen Lautstand, wie ihn Fick reconstituiert, etwa mit demjenigen, welchen Brugmann in seinem Grundrisse

¹ Es kommen hier namentlich in Betracht Fick's Buch "Die ehemalige Spracheinheit der Indogermanen Europa's" (Gött., 1873), seine Aufsätze: "Europäisches *ā* und *ē*" (Bezz. Beitr. 2, 193 ff.), "Schwā Indogermanicum" (ebd. 3, 157 ff.; vgl. "Zum schwā im Griechischen," 5, 166 ff.) und "Zum Aorist- und Perfectablaut im Griechischen" (ebd. 4, 167 ff.), sowie die von ihm in Recensionen in den Gött. Gel. Anz. ausgesprochenen Ansichten, (Jhg. 1880, St. 14; 1881, St. 14 u. 45-46 u. 1883, St. 19).

annimmt, so wird man bemerken dass die Ansichten beider sich im Ganzen ziemlich nahe stehen, wenn auch im Einzelnen noch einige Unterschiede bleiben. Am Abschlusse der Untersuchungen über die Gutturale und die Vocale stehen wir freilich auch jetzt noch nicht. Es ist bezeichnend, dass Fick am Schlusse der Vorrede eine Theorie beistimmend erwähnt, die kürzlich von Bezenberger (und gleichzeitig von Osthoff) aufgestellt ist, und nach welcher die Gutturalreihen wiederum erheblich anders aufzufassen wären.

Eine nicht minder wichtige Änderung wie die Phonetik, weist die Morphologie der Ursprache auf. Die vorige Auflage des Wörterbuches war schon abgeschlossen, als der Verf. die Entdeckung machte, dass die sogen. "thematischen Vocale" nicht als "Suffixe" sondern als Bestandteile der "Wurzel" aufzufassen seien, mithin ein grosser Teil der Indogerm. Wurzeln für zweisilbig zu gelten habe. Ein Verbalstamm *bhere-*, den man früher als Wz. *bher* + Suff. *e* auffasste, zerlegt sich für Fick in die beiden Elemente *bhe* + *re*; die einsilbige Wurzel *bher-* ist nach seiner Meinung erst aus dem zweisilbigen *bhere-* nach Analogie andrer, wirklich einsilbiger Wurzeln gekürzt. Fick hat diese Auffassung niedergelegt in seinem Aufsätze "Die suffixlosen Nomina der Griechischen Sprache" in Bezenb. Beitr. Bd. I.¹ Die Ansetzung der Wortformen in der neuen Auflage ist von ihr wesentlich beeinflusst. Zugleich ist der Verf. gegen früher noch einen Schritt weiter gegangen in dem Bestreben, die "Wurzeln," wo immer es möglich war, durch Verba zu ersetzen. Im Principe hat er mit der Aufstellung von Wurzeln völlig gebrochen, gemäss seinem in den Gött. Gel. Anz. 1880, S. 420 ausgesprochenen Satze: "Auch ist die Vorstellung von 'Wurzeln' ganz

¹ Man vergleiche auch Fick's Ausführungen in den Gött. Gel. Anz. 1880, St. 14 u. 1881, St. 45-46. Die Theorie der zweisilbigen Wurzeln wird zuweilen de Saussure zugeschrieben. Aber dieser hat sie von Fick übernommen (Fick's grundlegende Abhandlung, die in enger Beziehung zu seiner—im Nachworte zur 2. u. 3. Aufl. des Wörterbuches vorgetragenen—Auffassung der Wurzeldeterminative steht, ist im 1. Hefte von Bezzb. Beitr. im J. 1876, de Saussure's Buch erst 1879 erschienen), wenn ihm auch das Verdienst bleibt, sie durch wichtige neue Beobachtungen gestützt zu haben. Früher hatte schon Ascoli den Bau der indogerm. Wurzeln dem der semitischen verglichen (siehe dessen Sprachw. Briefe S. 143 d. Übers.). Man sehe über diese Fragen neuerdings bes. Johansson, De deriv. verbis contr. pp. 81-99 (u. BB. 13, 116; 14, 155 ff.; 15, 308) und Per Persson, Stud. z. Lehre von der Wurzelweiterung, Upsala, 1891, S. 95.

aufzugeben und also z. B. nicht eine 'Wurzel *derk*,' sondern der starke Präsensstamm *derko-* zu Grunde zu legen."¹ Wo er noch Wurzeln ansetzt, sind sie ihm nicht mehr im Sinne der älteren Sprachforschung Ausdruck des ursprünglichen Kernes der Worte, sondern ein Bekenntnis des Nichtwissens. Sie besagen, dass es einstweilen nicht möglich ist, das Verbum, welches sich hinter der Wurzel versteckt, mit Sicherheit wiederherzustellen. Es ist dies ein Fortschritt, zu welchem die Handhabung der reconstruierenden Methode mit einer gewissen Notwendigkeit führt. Die Ursprache hat durch das Aufgeben mathematischer Formeln sehr an Verständlichkeit und an wirklichem Leben gewonnen.

In allen Teilen erscheinen die proethnischen Wörter zum ersten Male accentuiert, wenigstens soweit, als der Verf. den Accent glaubte sicher reconstruieren zu können. Auch die Altindischen Wörter sind jetzt (nach Grassmann's Wörterbuch zum Rigveda, das erst nach dem Abschlusse der vorigen Auflage fertig vorlag) mit Accenten versehen. Man wird auch sonst bemerken, dass der Verf. bemüht gewesen ist die Accente und Laute der von ihm angeführten Wörter genau wiederzugeben. Einige Accentfehler und sonstige kleine Versehen freilich, die zum Teil bis auf die erste Auflage zurückgehen, sind auch jetzt noch stehen geblieben.

Trotz den vielen neuen Etymologien, welche in der vierten Auflage hinzugekommen sind, nimmt der Wortschatz der Ursprache nur drei Fünftel des Raumes in Anspruch, welcher ihr in der vorigen Auflage eingeräumt war (154 Seiten gegen 258 der 3. Aufl.). Es rührt dies hauptsächlich daher, dass zweifelhafte Etymologien ausgeschieden sind. Die Fäden der Reconstruction konnten jetzt in Bezug auf Laute und Formen vielfach fester geschnürt werden, als ehemals, und es musste nun manches getrennt und bei Seite gelassen werden, was früher vereinbar schien. Man vergleiche beispielsweise den Artikel *dhēmy* (S. 73), der jetzt nur drei Zeilen umfasst, während er früher (*dhaman*, *dhāman* I³, S. 114) reichlich eine halbe Seite in Anspruch nahm und viele Bildungen vereinigte, die in ihren Vocalen und Suffixen nicht genau zu einander stimmen. Auch in der äusseren Einrichtung des Buches ist auf Raumersparnis Bedacht genommen. In ähnlicher Weise und aus denselben Gründen steht der zweite "Arische" (d. h. Indo-Iranische) Teil an äusserem Umfange um

¹Ähnlich spricht sich der Verf. in der Anzeige von Sayce's Introduction to the Science of Language, G. G. A. 1881, S. 425 ff. aus.

etwa ein Zehntel hinter der vorigen Auflage zurück, obwohl er an neuen Etymologien erheblich zugenommen hat. Der dritte Teil, die "Westeuropäische" Einheit, lässt sich mit der "Europäischen" Einheit der vorigen Auflage nicht unmittelbar vergleichen. Im Ganzen ist der Umfang des ersten Bandes von 843 Seiten der 3. Aufl. jetzt auf 580 reduciert.

Zum Schlusse sei der interessanten Einleitung gedacht, welche diesmal dem Wörterbuche voraufgeschickt ist. Sie soll "gewisse Ansätze und Anordnungen der Arbeit begründen" und behandelt die Frage nach der Einteilung der Indogermanischen Sprachen und den proethnischen Einheiten, ferner einige Probleme der Laut- und Formenlehre, welche für die Reconstruction der Grundformen besonders in Betracht kommen. Ausserdem nimmt der Verf. die Frage nach der Benennung unsres Sprachstammes wieder auf. Bei ihr möchte ich noch einen Augenblick stehen bleiben. Fick behält den Namen "Indogermanen" bei, nicht weil er ihn für die richtigste Bezeichnung hält, sondern weil er einmal eingebürgert und nicht schlechter als einer der andern sei. Die richtigste Benennung wäre nach seiner Meinung Teut-Arier oder Ario-Teuten, da "Arier" der historisch beglaubigte gemeinsame Name der Inder und Iranier sei, und andererseits die Europäischen Sprachen (nach Ausweis von Osk. *toito* = Altir. *tiath* = Germ. *peuda* = Lett. *tauta*) für "Volk, Gemeinde" das Wort *teutā* besaßen. Ich stimme ganz bei, möchte aber fragen: können wir nicht nach dem Principe, welches Fick in seinem Buche über die Griechischen Personennamen so schön erläutert und für die Ursprache erwiesen hat, als Abkürzung für jenes Compositum den Ausdruck "Arier" verwenden? Fick freilich erhebt gegen diese Ausdehnung des Namens Arier ziemlich energischen Protest. Er sagt (S. xi): "Die Benennung ist kurz und wohlklingend, aber leider—falsch. Nur die Eroberer Indiens und Érans sowie die Skythen haben sich selbst 'Ariya, Ârya' benannt und zwar als die frommen rechtgläubigen Glieder einer Kirche im Gegensatze zu den wüsten Cultusgreueln der Ureingeborenen. Wir haben nicht das Recht den Umfang dieser Selbstbezeichnung weiter auszudehnen auf die Glieder unseres Stammes, welche sich selbst nicht mit diesem Namen belegten." Aber den Namen "Indogermanen" haben doch sicher weder die Inder, Eranier und Skythen noch irgend eines der anderen Glieder als Selbstbezeichnung verwandt. Den Namen "Arier" als Gesamtnamen verwerfen weil er nicht überall nachzuweisen ist und statt dessen die

"Indogermanen" einführen, heisst doch wol vom Regen in die Traufe gehen. Ausserdem halte ich es nicht für ausgemacht, dass der Name "Arier" den Ursprung hatte, welchen Fick ihm beilegt. Ich glaube nämlich dass das Altind. *aryá-s* (von seiner Verwendung als Volksname zunächst abgesehen) nebst seiner Zwillingsform *ari-s* nicht nur mit Fick der Indo-Iranischen Epoche sondern der Ursprache zuzuweisen ist, und ursprünglich die Bedeutung "ausgezeichnet, edel, tüchtig" hatte. Die Verknüpfung des Namens *Érin*, Gen. *Érin* "Irland" mit *arya-* halte ich allerdings nicht für sicher; aber darin stimme ich Zimmer (Bb. B. 3. 148 ff.) mit Windisch (Ersch u. Gruber's Encykl., II. Sect., Bd. 35, S. 139 Anm.) bei, dass altir. *aire*, Gen. *airech* "princeps," seiner Bildung nach mit ssk. *āryaka-* nahezu identisch, hierher gehört. Ausserdem glaube ich sichere Spuren dieser Worte im Griechischen zu finden. *ari-* liegt als Compositionsmitglied in der abgeschwächten Bedeutung "sehr" in Hom. *ἀριγυνωτος*, *ἀρι-δείκετος*, *ἀρι-πρεπής* u. s. w. vor. Als selbständiges Adjectivum ist **ári-s* durch *ἀγαθός* verdrängt. Aber Comparativ und Superlativ dazu sind in unveränderter Bedeutung in *ἀρ-ε-ίων* "tüchtiger, edler" *ἄρ-ισ-τος* "der edelste, tüchtigste" erhalten. Wenn *arya-* also im Veda und Avesta als Bezeichnung der Anhänger des echten Gottesdienstes gilt, so halte ich das für eine specialisierte Bedeutung: die "Edlen" konnten recht wohl zu den "Echten" werden.¹ Bekanntlich aber wird im Veda *arya-* auch als Beiname von Göttern gebraucht und in einem Sinne verwendet, den Roth mit "anhänglich, treu ergeben, lieb; zugetan, gütig" wiedergibt. Hier bleibt also doch ein ziemlich weiter Spielraum. Sodann heisst *ari-s*, das man doch von *aryá-s* nicht trennen kann, nach Roth "(aufstrebend), verlangend, begierig, anhänglich." Ich fasse alle diese begrifflichen Nuancen als Umwandlungen des Begriffes "tüchtig, edel," wobei man für *ari-s* die Mittelstufe "vorwärts strebend" annehmen mag.² Im Avesta scheint *airya-* schon durchweg Eigenname zu sein und einfach "Arisch, Arier" zu bedeuten. Was die Skythen anlangt, so steht meines Wissens nur fest, dass sie das Wort *Arya-* als Compositionsmitglied in Personennamen gebrauchten. Legen wir dem Urvolke den Namen "Arier" bei, so laufen wir schlimmsten Falles Gefahr, ein in der Ursprache als appellativum gebrauchtes Wort als nomen

¹ Man beachte auch den Bedeutungsübergang von griech. *ιερός* "regsam, tüchtig" (*ιερός* *ἰχθύς*, *ιερὴ* *ἰς* *Τηλεμάχου*, Hom.) zu "heilig."

² Freilich aber wäre auch möglich, dass in *ari-s* zwei Worte, den Griechischen *ἀρι-* und *ἐπι-* entsprechend, zusammengefallen sind.

proprium zu verwenden (wie bei der Verwendung des Namens "Teuten" oder "Teutonen" für die Europäischen Völker unsres Stammes). Aber es ist gleich wohl möglich, dass der Gebrauch des Wortes als *nomen proprium* schon aus der Ursprache stammt und nur im Osten des Gebietes sich erhalten hat, etwa wie heute die "Romani" (von den wissenschaftlichen Termini "Romanen" und "Romanisch" abgesehen), fast nur noch in den "Rumänen" weiterleben. Auch den Einwand, es stehe der Anwendung des Wortes "Arier" im weiteren Sinne der "rechtmässige" Gebrauch des Wortes im engeren Sinne im Wege, kann ich nicht gelten lassen. Der Sprachgebrauch ist längst ins Schwanken geraten, da sich "Aryan" für Indogermanisch im Englischen bereits eingebürgert hat. Für Inder und Iranier wird auch schon vielfach die Bezeichnung "Indo-Iranier" oder "Ost-Arier" gebraucht, und es lässt sich damit jedenfalls auskommen. Ich begreife vollkommen, dass es jedem, der gewohnt ist unter den Ariern die Inder und Iranier zu verstehen und das Urvolk als Indogermanen zu bezeichnen, schwer wird diese Terminologie aufzugeben. Aber ich glaube mit Pictet, M. Müller, Sayce, Scherer u. a., das bei der Ausdehnung des Wortes "Arier" auf das Urvolk der Gewinn grösser ist als der Schaden.

Anlage und allgemeiner Charakter des Werkes nötigten zu so langem Verweilen, dass ich für diesmal darauf verzichten muss, auf einzelne Etymologien—sei es zustimmend oder zweifelnd oder mit dem Versuche, das vom Verf. gesammelte Wortmaterial zu ergänzen—näher einzugehen, wiewohl auch die Reichhaltigkeit des Buches an neuen Gedanken dazu einlädt. Vielleicht wird sich mir dazu später Gelegenheit bieten. Nur *eine* Ausnahme möchte ich hier machen zu Gunsten einer Etymologie, der ich in mehr als einer Beziehung eine ungewöhnliche Bedeutung beimesse; ich meine die Deutung des Zahlwortes für 8, welcher wir S. 15 der neuen Auflage begegnen. Es war von andren bemerkt, dass dieses Zahlwort eine Endung hat, die sonst vorzugsweise bei Dualen vorkommt (s. Meringer K. Z. 28, S. 232). Aber es blieb ein Rätsel, wie die 8-Zahl dazu komme, in ihrer Flexion mit der 2-Zahl zusammenzugehen. Fick gibt die Lösung in folgenden Worten: "oçtô' ist Dual eines von oç 'schärfen' abgeleiteten Nomens 'Schärfe, Spitze' und bezeichnet die Achtzahl als 'die beiden Spitzen' (der Hände); die Spitze der Hand wird von den vier Fingern ausser dem Daumen gebildet."

HERMANN COLLITZ.

III.—DID PHILOCHORUS QUOTE THE ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ AS ARISTOTLE'S?

"Whether the original treatise [i. e. the original edition of the recently discovered 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία] was by Aristotle, or by an immediate pupil, as Rose has maintained, is quite another question. It can be proved, however, we believe—though this is not the place to do it—that the historian Philochorus, writing before B. C. 306,¹ or less than twenty years after the composition of the work, quoted it as Aristotle's,² sometimes to supplement, some-

¹ Philochorus held the office of *ἱεροσκόπος* Ol. 118, 3, B. C. 306 (Müller, F. H. G. I, p. 403, Frag. 146=Dion. Hal., Din. 3, 637)—i. e. was in middle life—and was put to death B. C. 261 (Suid. s. v.) after a long life of enormous literary activity spent at Athens. Of the seventeen books of his Atthis, books I-VI were apparently issued first, as a complete work (*πρὸς τὴν Δήμωνος Ἀτθίδα, ἢ πρὸς Δήμωνα ἀντιγραφὴ*), and must have preceded the others by some time (Boeckh, Kl. Schriften, V, p. 429). Book VI, however, contains words that imply a reference to twelve Athenian tribes (Frag. 130 b: *Δημητριάς* and *Ἀντιγονίς*), and therefore could not have been written before 307 B. C. Philochorus must have been engaged upon the Atthis in the prime of his powers. His *ἐπιτομὴ τῆς ἰδίας Ἀτθίδος* presupposes the completion of the whole work some considerable time before his death.

² Rose, who had only the fragments upon which to build, has already suggested that Philochorus knew the Respub. Ath., but he ascribes the *Πολιτεία*, not to Aristotle, but to Demetrius Phalereus. "Huius [Dem. Phal.] igitur opus Aristotelis nomine inscriptum Timaeus legit, idem probabile est iam novisse Philochorum," Aristot. Pseudepigr. p. 398. Rose's reasons for thus assigning the authorship are the following: the constitution of Athens described in some of the fragments appears to be more aristocratic in character than that prevalent before about 317 B. C.; on the other hand, the fragments show that the work was composed before the ten tribes were increased to twelve (B. C. 307). "Quae vero vestigia pauca occurrunt (cf. fr. 31 [=Aristot. Fragg. 414], 85 [= ibid. 469]), quibus rempublicam qualis erat post Euclidem in aristocraticam magis speciem mutata fuisse credas, ea quoque plane conveniunt Demetrii Phalerei tempori quo politiarum auctorem sive Atheniensem sive Athenis commoratum scripsisse vidimus, scilicet Ol. 116 vel 117 (inter Ol. 115, 3—118, 2)," Rose, *ibid.* p. 398. His first inference, however, was based on insufficient data and is not borne out by the complete text of the original work; on the other hand, internal evidence conclusively shows that the work was composed not only before 307 B. C., but certainly not later than 324 B. C., i. e. before the death of Aristotle. Schvarcz (Ungarische Rev., 1891, April) has lately revived Rose's view of the Demetrian authorship of the Respub. Ath., but hardly with success.

times to controvert its statements."—The Nation, May 7, 1891, No. 1349, p. 382.

I purpose here to present in brief the reasons that caused me to write the foregoing sentences: viz. to show that the Aristotelian authorship of the *Respublica Atheniensium* was acknowledged by Philochorus.

I. It is perfectly safe to infer from many of the fragments of his *Atthis* that Philochorus frequently quoted from earlier historical writers and authorities. As examples *Fragg.* 128, 152, 96, 40 (Müller, *F. H. G.*, I, p. 391, ff.) may be adduced. In *Frag.* 128 (*Harpoc.*, s. *Στρώμη*), we read that Philochorus cited Archilochus as authority for his remarks about the island Stryme. In *Frag.* 152 (*Harpoc.*, s. *ἀμπίποι*) Philochorus appears to be citing the views of Thucydides and Xenophon, and to be giving a fuller explanation of the word in question;¹ possibly he had also in mind *Respub. Ath.* (ed. Kenyon) c. 49, p. 122, l. 24 (for Kenyon's *ἀνίππους* read, with Blass, *ἀμύππους*). In *Frag.* 96 (*Harpoc.*, s. *Λύκειον*) is not Philochorus correcting, while he quotes, the historian Theopompus? Perhaps doubt may attach to some of the preceding examples,—hardly, however, to the following. In *Frag.* 40 (*Plut. Thes.* 19) Philochorus quotes and controverts Demo: indeed, the first six books of the *Atthis* bore the alternative title *ἡ πρὸς Δήμωνα ἀντιγραφὴ* (*Harpoc.* s. *Ἡτιωνεία*, *Suid.* s. *τριτοπάτορες*), and contained many criticisms of Demo's views. But above all Philochorus appears to have made abundant references to the *Atthis* of Androtion, instances of which need not here be adduced.² It is universally admitted that the *Atthid*-writers in general freely quoted and criticised each other.

II. There are, accordingly, sufficient *a priori* grounds for supposing that the *Respub. Ath.*—demonstrably composed before B. C. 324, and doubtless published at once—would have been quoted by Philochorus, especially if it was the work of Aristotle. The historical sketch of an obscure writer so near his own day he would probably have made little use of. In the following frag-

¹ The *μήποτε* here, however,—a mark of the style of Didymus—suggests that it may have been after all only Didymus that combined these citations and suggested the fuller explanation.

² "Von seinen Vorgängern hat Philochorus sicherlich die *Atthis* des Androtion stark benutzt. Oefter werden gerade Philochorus und Androtion zusammen citirt. Vgl. *Fragm.* 59, 120, 130 a, 133, 150, 153." Busolt, *Griech. Geschichte*, I, pp. 365, 366 and note.

ments I think we are obliged to see examples of quotation, although it must be admitted that the coincidences may in part be otherwise accounted for. In Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1223 (cf. Schol. Lys. 58) we have a Didymean quotation from Philochorus. Though the name of Philochorus is not given, a comparison of the subject-matter of Schol. Lys. 58 and the last part of Schol. Vesp. 1223 with the language of Strabo IX 392 C., where Philochorus is named as the authority, proves conclusively the Philochorean origin of this scholium.¹ Now in this scholium is imbedded a slightly abbreviated quotation from Respub. Ath. c. 13, pp. 35, l. 9–36, l. 6. The form of the introductory words (*κατὰ τοὺς Σόλωνος χρόνους*—Codd. *νόμους*) is distinctly Philochorean, and shows that Didymus is here quoting only Philochorus, with Aristotle at second-hand, and not the two writers coördinately, i. e. Schol. Vesp. 1223 = Didymus (Philochorus [Aristotle]), not = Didymus (Philochorus + Aristotle + Philochorus). Further, in Frag. 57 (Suid. s. *σεισάχθεια*) one can hardly fail to see in Philochorus's *ἀποψηφισθῆναι τὸ ἄχθος* an intended correction or explanation of *ἀποσεισάμενοι τὸ βάρος* in Respub. Ath. c. 6, p. 15, l. 17, here worded *τὸ ἄχθος ἀποσεισάσθαι*. And in Frag. 58 (St. Maximus, prol. in S. Dionysii Areop. Opera, Vol. II, pp. ix, x: ed. 1776), the words *οἱ παρ' Ἀθηναίους πρωτεύοντες ἔν τε γένει καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ βίῳ χρηστῶ*, apparently ascribed to Philochorus,² are strikingly like the *ἡ γὰρ αἵρεσις τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλουτίνδην ἦν ἐξ ὧν οἱ Ἀρεοπαγίται καθίσταντο* of Respub. Ath. c. 3 *ad fin.* The coincidences between Fragg. 67, 68 (*ἀδύνατοι*) and 101 and Respub. Ath. c. 49, p. 124, and c. 53, p. 130 foot, where Philochorus treats of the same subject with Aristotle, may be otherwise accounted for. And the resemblances between Fragg. 65 and Respub. Ath. c. 7, p. 17, l. 3; between 122 and Respub. Ath. c. 29, p. 81, ll. 4 ff.; between 118 and Respub. Ath. c. 34, p. 92, l. 1—cited, with most of the foregoing, by W. L. Newman, in the Classical Review, Vol. V, p. 158

¹ Meiners (Diss. Halens. XI, pp. 364–366) has shown the Philochorean character of Schol. Lys. 58, and of the latter part of Schol. Vesp. 1223. This new fragment of Philochorus should be inserted in Müller, F. H. G., I, probably between Fragg. 65 and 66, and not—since it begins with *κατὰ τοὺς Σόλωνος χρόνους*—as Meiners would place it, after Frag. 35.

² Though the name of Androtion is cited as an authority for a statement occurring in this work between these words and the place where Philochorus is named, the substance of this sentence repeated at the latter place is given as Philochorus's, and we are safe in inferring that the words quoted above are traceable to Philochorus.

(March, 1891)—are too remote to serve as certain examples of direct quotation.¹

III. The examples that we have thus far considered, doubtful though some of them may be, show, as a whole, two things: first, that it is quite certain that Philochorus quoted from the *Respub. Ath.*, and, second, that it is highly probable that he named the author of his quotations. It is likely that the number of examples of a connexion between these two writers will be discovered to be much larger, now that we have in the complete text of the *Respub. Ath.* a new touchstone to apply, in the examination of the later and derived literature.

But is it possible to change the proposition that Philochorus named Aristotle, from a probability into a certainty? It seems to me that the demonstration desired may be found in the inferences that we are obliged to draw from the language of *Plut. Them. 10* (cf. *Cat. 5*), and *Aelian, De Nat. Anim. 12, 35* (see *Rose, Aristot. Fragg. 398, 399*). In *Plut. Them. 10* a long account is given of certain events immediately preceding the battle of Salamis. We are told that Themistocles, making use of divine portents and oracular utterances, prevailed upon the Athenian folk to pass a decree committing their city to Athena, directing the men of military age to embark upon the triremes, and women, children and slaves to save themselves as best they could. Aristotle is cited as authority for the statement that the Areopagus, in the lack of public funds, provided each soldier with eight drachmae, and thereby filled the ships-of-war.² Cleidemus is next quoted as asserting

¹ In *Frag. 79 b* there are several subjects that occur in the *Respub. Ath.*—time of *ὀστρακοφορία*, regulation limiting the residence of ostracised persons, origin of the custom (cc. 44, 22 *ad fin.*, 22 *ad med.*)—but, although the phraseology is, at least on the last point, almost identical in the two writers, the different order in which the subjects come up suggests that both are drawing from a common source, each framing his narrative to suit himself, rather than that Philochorus is quoting from Aristotle. Perhaps this explanation is the correct one for coincidences in some of the other doubtful passages mentioned above. F. Cauer, *Hat Aristoteles die Schrift vom Staat der Athener geschrieben?* pp. 37, 38, calls attention to *Fragg. 17* [*Respub. Ath. c. 8, p. 24*, on the competency of the Areopagus], and 33 [*Respub. Ath. c. 3, p. 5*, on *Ion*], with 79, as proofs that the writer of the *Respub. Ath.* and Philochorus were drawing from the same source.

² *Plut. Them. 10*: οὐκ ὄντων δὲ δημοσίων χρημάτων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, Ἀριστοτέλης μὲν ἔφη τὴν ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου βουλὴν πορίσασαν ὀκτὼ δραχμὰς ἐκάστῳ τῶν στρατευομένων αἰτιωτάτην γενέσθαι τοῦ πληρωθῆναι τὰς τριήρεις. Cf. *Respub. Ath. c. 23*: τῶν γὰρ στρατηγῶν ἐξαπορησάντων τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ κληνξάντων σφίζειν ἕκαστον ἑαυτὸν, πορίσασα δραχμὰς ἐκάστῳ ὀκτὼ διέδωκε [*sc. ἡ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλῇ*] καὶ ἐνεβίβασεν εἰς τὰς ναῦς.

that this action also was due to the wiles of Themistocles. Then follows a pathetic account of the departure of the people from their homes, in which the story is told of the dog of Xanthippus, father of Pericles, which swam by the side of its master's trireme across the strait to Salamis, but died of exhaustion on reaching the further shore, where in later times its grave was pointed out (*Κυνὸς σῆμα*). In Plut. Cat. 5 there is a reference to the instance of the dog of Xanthippus and his burial-place. In neither of these accounts does Plutarch give us his authorities for this episode. Fortunately, however, in Aelian, *De Nat. Anim.* 12, 35, the story recurs in part, as an illustration of the devotion of dogs to their masters, and the excerpt concludes with the significant words *λέγεται δὲ ἅρα ταῦτα Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ Φιλόχορος*. The general resemblance between Plutarch's and Aelian's forms of the narrative, though not closely verbal, is marked enough to make it certain that the two accounts are traceable to the same original. The lack of close resemblance shows that one of the narratives is one or two degrees further removed from the original than the other; the remoter one in this case is probably Aelian's,¹ who takes his facts at second-hand much oftener than Plutarch.² The resemblance between the two accounts begins

¹ The sources of Aelian's *De Nat. Anim.* have not yet been satisfactorily explored. For the *Var. Hist.* we have Rudolph's careful study (*Leipz. Stud. VII*, pp. 1-138), in which are a few remarks on the *De Nat. Anim.* (pp. 86, 134-137). Of course Favorinus (*Παντοδαπὴ Ἱστορία*) was Aelian's great mine, but he had also other sources. In the *Var. Hist.* there are many citations from Attic writers, but they are not original citations (Rudolph, p. 35). Now, in the *De Nat. Anim.*, Aelian quotes (at second or third hand) from Aristotle *De Anim.* (Rose, *A. P.*, pp. 276 ff.). It appears that Asinius Pollio, of Tralles, wrote on Aristotle *De Anim.*, as also an *ἐπιτομή* of Philochorus (Suid., s. *Πωλίων ὁ Ἀσίνιος*). Doubtless Aelian was familiar with the writings of this author, whose professional career was passed in Rome. Many of the Aristotelian quotations may have been taken from the Commentary, and the extract from Philochorus from the *ἐπιτομή*. But this is wholly conjectural. Rose and Rudolph would probably maintain that Aelian's relation to Aristotle (and to Philochorus) was yet more remote: Aristotelica — Aristophanes Byz. — Didymus — Pamphilus (*Λεμίων*) — Favorinus (*Παντοδαπὴ Ἱστορία*) — Aelian. Wellmann (*De Istro Callimachio*, p. 7) contends that the story of Alcmena aided by a weasel (*γαλῆ*) in Aelian, *Var. Hist.* 12, p. 426, is traceable through Alexander Myndius to Ister. This would suggest for the dog story the following transmission: Philochorus — Ister — Alexander Myndius — Aelian.

² In Aelian's *Ξανθίππου τοῦ Ἀρίφρονος* (cf. *Respub. Ath.* c. 22) — as, perhaps, also in other turns — we have, however, the survival of an earlier form of statement than the *Ξανθίππου τοῦ Περικλέους πατρός* of Plutarch.

back at Plutarch's words about *σημεῖα δαιμόνια* and *χρησμούς*—expressions, it should be noted, that precede the mention of the names of Aristotle and Cleidemus. Aelian, as we have seen, informs us that the facts stated by him are mentioned by Aristotle and Philochorus. The Respub. Ath. does not, however, in its present form, give the incident about the dog—though what Plutarch quoted is there given—and there is no reason to believe that it ever was in the work. And, under the circumstances, to suppose that the story occurred in some other work of Aristotle,¹ raises more difficulties than it solves. There can, however, be no doubt of the truth of Aelian's statement that the story was found in Philochorus; the story is of a sort that Philochorus would be likely to relate,² and, furthermore, Philochorus is an extremely frequent source for Plutarch.³ We are accordingly safe in inferring that Philochorus was at least one of Plutarch's sources for the passage cited from the Them., and doubtless an immediate source. How, then, are we to account for the mention of the name of Aristotle by Aelian? The most probable answer to this question seems to me to be the following: Aelian, or his source, had read an extract from Philochorus concerning the events preceding the battle of Salamis, in which the name of Aristotle occurred, only a

¹ "Fieri potest ut in zoico quodam libro haec dixerit Aristoteles, sicut in Hist. An. Z 24 mulum ab Atheniensibus immunitatum donatum commemorat: cuius Plutarchus in eodem capite Catonis cum cane Xanthippi meminit, sed fortasse omnino erravit de Aristotele Aelianus. de Philochoro verum dicit: nam in Themistocle ex Atthide pendet Plutarchus." Kaibel-Wilamowitz, *Aristotelis 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία*, p. 92.

² Cf. Frag. 146, from the Atthis, book IX (Dion. Hal., Din. 3, 637) about the dog that visited the Acropolis, and finally lay down on the altar of Zeus Herceus. It was to explain this portent that Philochorus was called upon as *ἱεροσκόπος*. That the Atthis abounded in odd information a cursory examination of the fragments at once reveals.

³ Plutarch's citations from Philochorus are occasionally made at first-hand, though sometimes through Ister. Gilbert's assumption that in the Theseus, where the traces of Philochorus are most numerous, Plutarch drew wholly—except cc. 1, 2—from Ister's *Συναγωγή* (Philol. 33, pp. 46 ff.) has been shown to be faulty by Wellmann (De Istro Callimachio, pp. 19 ff.). The latter writer demonstrates that though Ister is abundantly used, it is equally clear that Philochorus is now and then presented by Plutarch in a purer form than we find him in Ister, i. e. in his original form (e. g., according to Wellmann, the narratives in Thes. cc. 14, 16, 19, perhaps 24, also 31, 35, 36). For other remarks on Philochorus as a source for Plutarch, see Harvard Studies, III, pp. 26, 27, and notes.

short space above the account of the dog,—the matter that had mainly attracted Aelian's attention—and, by a blunder natural in rapid reading, Aelian (or his source) inferred that Aristotle in the quotation, as well as Philochorus, had told the story of the dog. Perhaps the mistake was made in Aelian's source, which, however, perpetuated the name of Philochorus as author of the extract; but it could hardly have been made if Aristotle's name had not occurred in Philochorus's account. We cannot, accordingly, escape the inference that Philochorus quoted Aristotle by name, and it is highly probable that in this passage from Plut. Them. 10, we have essentially, from the beginning to the end, the extract—quotations and all, here somewhat paraphrased and expanded—which, under the name of Philochorus as author, and greatly reduced in bulk, retaining, however, the name of Aristotle, lay before Aelian's authority.¹

The most obvious objection that will be raised to our inference will be of this nature: Plutarch, it will be said, may have been quoting from Philochorus for a part of his narrative, but the reference to Aristotle was not in the original Philochorus passage; it was inserted by Plutarch. To this objection two answers should be made: (1) Aelian's use of Aristotle's name remains unaccounted for; (2) Plutarch was not in the habit of quoting the Respub. Ath. at first-hand.² Indeed, one may incidentally remark, had Plu-

¹ If our reasoning be sound, we have in this passage a new fragment for Philochorus. It should be inserted in Müller, F. H. G., I, just before Frag. 84, which forms its conclusion.

² There is, of course, no *a priori* reason why Plutarch should not have consulted the Respub. Ath. at first-hand, nor why he might not have had the book in his library. The Berlin papyrus, the copy recently discovered, the entry in the catalogue of an Egyptian library of the third century A. D. (Zündel, Rhein. Mus. 1866, p. 432, quoted by Rose, Aristot. Fragg., p. 260), besides other indications, show that copies of this treatise were current after the Christian era. But an examination of Plut. Solon and Pericles, where the traces of Aristotle are most marked, convinces me that in the composition at least of these Lives Plutarch took his Aristotle at second-hand. Between the Sol. and the Respub. Ath. there is a vast number of coincidences at more than forty points; there are, on the other hand, not a few statements in Plutarch's narrative at variance with the distinct language of unquoted parts of the Respub. Ath. Now those who maintain that Plutarch read his Respub. Ath. at first-hand will explain the discrepancies on the theory that Plutarch merely dipped in here and there, without carefully reading the whole work, and picked out various statements which he then wrought into the framework of his own narrative, without taking thought whether this was quite consistent with other statements of his author: the

tarch been reading the original Respub. Ath. at the time he was writing his Them. he could not have failed to introduce the highly characteristic anecdote of his hero, found only a few lines further down, which tells of the intrigue of Themistocles whereby Ephialtes was brought face to face with the Areopagus.

The bearing of the inference that we have drawn, if a sound inference from certain data, upon the question of the authorship of the Respub. Ath. is very important. The testimony that it affords on the point is the earliest yet adduced; even Timaeus's testimony as to the Πολιτεῖαι touches strictly only the Respub. Locr.¹ If Philochorus, the careful historical student and critic,

discrepancies, thus, are due to his not having carefully read the original work. This explanation, however, is unsatisfactory. The large number of coincidences, and the nature of these coincidences, show that the work from which Plutarch was quoting was very familiar to him, in framework and in substance, down to the minutest details. Hence, since he makes assertions that are contradictory of the Respub. Ath. in its original form, the work read by him cannot have been the Respub. Ath. in its original form. It must have been an abridgment, in which many important passages were omitted—such as the account of the Draconian constitution, the story of Themistocles, Ephialtes and the Areopagus, etc.—as well as numerous minor remarks (see Harvard Studies, III, p. 25, note 3).

I do not deny that another hypothesis can be suggested in explanation of the various phenomena, viz. that Plutarch's was the original work, not an abridgment, while the newly discovered treatise is not the original one at all, but rather a derived copy highly inflated and abounding with interpolations. Unfortunately, however, for this theory, alike the literary form of the present work, and the fact that passages at variance with Plutarch's statements are quoted as from the Respub. Ath. in the Fragments, point to the conclusion, first, that the present treatise (Brit. Mus. Papyrus, No. CXXXI) is before us in its original form, and, secondly, that in its substance it was more extensive than the book carefully studied by Plutarch.

If, then, in Sol. and Per., Plutarch took his Aristotle at second-hand, it is highly probable that in the Thes. he did the same. The absence of this part of the Respub. Ath. from the copy recently discovered, i. e. the account of earliest Attic history, makes it impossible to speak definitively on this point. One might, however, suggest that the information in Plut. Thes. 25 as to *εὐπατρίδαι*, *γεωμήτορες*, *δημιουργοί*, said to be derived from Aristotle, is given us in a form distinctly more secondary than that in Lex. Patm. Demosth., p. 152 (Sakkelion), Schol. Plat. Axioch., 371 D: Rose, Fragg. Nos. 384, 385. See my remarks on *εὐπατρίδαι* in Harvard Studies, III, p. 43, note.

¹ Cf. Polyb. exc. XII 5, 6, 8 and 11; Athen. VI 264 C and 272 A (Rose, A. P., pp. 496-498). Some of Timaeus's comments on Aristotle, which Polybius controverts, recall not a few of the criticisms passed of late on the Respub. Ath. by those who deny to it Aristotelian authorship, a form of skepticism which it did not occur to Timaeus to adopt.

who lived and wrote at Athens in the generation immediately following Aristotle's, looked upon the 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία as Aristotle's, should we hesitate so to do? Ought we not—if need be—to discard our previous conception of Aristotle's literary characteristics and mental habits for a larger and more catholic conception, rather than accept the highly improbable alternative that Philochorus was deceived?

J. H. WRIGHT.

IV.—ARISTOTLE ON THE PUBLIC ARBITRATORS.

The object of this paper is to draw from the newly discovered 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία such information as can fairly be drawn therefrom about the *δαιτηταί*. The discussion of the bearings of the work upon our knowledge of Athenian law and legal procedure has only begun, and will long continue. Of the articles and books that have come to my hands, besides Kenyon's edition, the only one which goes farther in this direction than to repeat in another form the more obvious statements of Aristotle is the paper of J. H. Lipsius in the *Berichte der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, pp. 41-69. Except so far as may be necessary for clearness, the certain results arrived at by Lipsius will not be repeated here.

The passages which bear upon the subject are in ch. 52, 53, 55, and 58. It is unnecessary to translate or quote them at length, but we may proceed at once to the discussion of them.

1. We have here another illustration of the *ισοτιμία* of the Athenian democracy, combined with the ancient respect for the dignity and dispassionateness of age, in that every Athenian who survived until the last of his forty-two years of liability to military service became *ipso facto* a judicial magistrate, unless indeed he held some other magistracy during that year or was out of the country. The term of service, lasting one year, was, as it were, the crown of the long period of public duties which fell to every full citizen. The explanation which Kenyon gives of the cycle of forty-two years and their *ἐπώνυμοι* suits all the known facts, and shows us a simple and practical arrangement, which furnished also, as Aristotle tells us, a convenient means of summoning the citizens to military service by their ages. The public records classified every citizen under the archon of the year in which he attained his majority, and under the *ἐπώνυμος* who marked the place of that year in the cycle. Since names instead of numbers were used for thus marking the year, the series had no fixed beginning or end, but merely a fixed order of succession. We may reasonably assume that the lists were revised every year under the direction of the *βουλή*, by striking out the names of the

dead or disfranchised and by adding the few names of the newly naturalized. Thus the Forty, at the beginning of their year of office, would find ready to their hand an official and public list of the new *διατρηταί*.

2. It is obvious that the number of the *διατρηταί* would vary greatly in different years, and all conclusions about their number that have been drawn from the well-known inscription C. I. A. II 943 fall to the ground. In that inscription the *διατρηταί* of the year 325-4 B. C., setting up a thank-offering for the customary decree of praise that had been passed by the people in their honor, are enumerated by name, and amount to 103, variously distributed among the different tribes. If now we ask what would be the probable number of Athenian citizens in their sixtieth year at any given time, a precise answer would be sought in vain. We know neither the exact number of Athenian citizens nor the death-rate among them. There can be no doubt, however, that the death-rate was far higher than in modern civilized communities. It is well known that the average duration of human life has vastly increased in Europe and America during the last fifty years; any estimate, therefore, derived from modern statistics of mortality would give far too high a number for ancient Athens. If we assume 20,000 as the number of Athenian citizens above eighteen years of age, we find that by the Northampton table of mortality (constructed from the records of a parish of Northampton, England, for the years 1735-1780 incl.), we might expect to find about 225 between the ages of fifty-nine and sixty. By the Carlisle table, showing a smaller mortality, we might expect to find about 275 between the same ages. The smaller number is certainly nearer the truth than the larger. And when we take into account the absence of sanitary precautions in ancient communities, the frequent recurrence of wars, plagues, and other epidemics, and the undeveloped state of medicine and surgery, there can be little doubt that even 225 is a large average. Moreover, it is clear that the limits of variation would be wide. A long war, or even a single destructive battle, a plague year, an epidemic attacking especially those above middle life, a few weeks of siege, might lessen materially the number of men available for a given year. It is well known also that a variety of circumstances may raise or lower the number of births for a given year far above or below the average. Taking all these things into account, it is not impossible that in 325-4 B. C. there should have been in Athens only

103 able-bodied full citizens of the required age not filling other magistracies.

On the other hand there is a suggestion of Bergk's that deserves to be considered. Following a still earlier suggestion of Ross, Bergk pointed out (*Rhein. Mus.* VII, p. 133) several dedicatory inscriptions of the *πρυτάνεις* of different years, in which less than the full number of names appear. For example, in one (C. I. A. II 872, 341-40 B. C., *Αιγυήϊδος πρυτάνεις*) there are forty-nine names; in another (C. I. A. II 329) forty-six names; in another (C. I. A. II 873) only thirty names appear to have been ever inscribed; although in yet others of the same class we find the full number of fifty (e. g. C. I. A. II 864 *Λεωντίδος*; 868 *Οινυήϊδος* B. C. 360-59; 869 *Ἀντιοχίδος*). Whether through indifference or poverty or other hindrance, then, it not infrequently occurred that after an official body voted an offering of this sort, a considerable percentage of the members failed to take part in the execution of the project. On the part of the *δαιτηταί* mere indifference was more to be expected than with the *πρυτάνεις*. They were not, as the *πρυτάνεις* were, men who had sought their office. It came to them as their military duty came; and we see from the description in Dem. against Meidias, 83-87, even making some allowance for rhetorical exaggeration, that at the end of the year a meeting of the body might be very thinly attended. It is highly probable that many out of their number might feel so little interest in the formality of setting up a dedicatory offering for a vote of praise which no longer meant much, as not to contribute to the expense for the sake of having their names inscribed. I incline to the opinion that the inscription of 325-4 B. C. does not include all the *δαιτηταί* of the year.

The inscription C. I. A. II 944 contains a list of the same sort, arranged in the same way by tribes and demes, with but three letters of *δαιτηταί* in the superscription, and incomplete. The first six tribes of the former list are lacking; but under *Κεκροπίδος* are given twenty-four, under *Ἰπποθωντίδος* twenty, under *Αλαντίδος* twenty-four, under *Ἀντιοχίδος* twenty-three, in all ninety-two names, with space for a few more. The comparatively even distribution of the names among the tribes, in contrast with their distribution on the former stone, is noticeable. Yet Koehler is probably right in assigning the inscription to the same class as No. 943. If now we assume between ninety-two and the number in the other six tribes the same ratio as holds between the corresponding

groups in the preceding inscription, we obtain 231 as the probable number of the original complete list; or if we assume the same average number for each of the other six tribes as that in these four, then the probable entire number would be 230. This number is rather above the probable average size of the college, while 103 is considerably below. The two inscriptions belong to about the same age; there is nothing in the numbers to forbid their being identical in character; while it would be unsafe to build any large structure upon so uncertain foundation, we may fairly believe, until other evidence comes to light, that these figures 103 and 231 represent nearly the extreme limits of size of the college of the *δαιτηταί*. The statement of Ulpian that there were forty-four from each tribe, or 440 in all, is definitely proved to be a mistake.

3. The passages taken together furnish confirmation, if any were still needed, of Bergk's conclusion that the *δαιτηταί* were organized into a college, although no certain light is thrown upon the question of their division into sections, nor upon the problem of the relation of the different sections to the tribes. In ch. 53 the phrase *διανέμουνσιν αὐτοῖς τὰς διαίτας* appears to describe a different act from that referred to in the following words, *καὶ ἐπικληροῦσιν ἅς ἕκαστος δαιτήσσει*, which clearly denote the selection of the individual arbitrator by lot. To the former expression corresponds in ch. 58 the phrase *διανείμαντα δέκα μέρη*; but how we are to conceive the process of division is not clear, since the cases did not come before the Forty and the Polemarch respectively all at once, but separately from time to time during the year. With regard to the appeal from the college in case a member was condemned on an *εἰσαγγελία*, Aristotle seems to contradict Dem. against Meidias 87, where the force of the argument depends on the representation that Straton, once condemned by the *δαιτηταί*, has no recourse; the phrase *καθάπαξ ἄτιμος γέγονεν* and others cannot be explained away as rhetorical exaggeration. Doubtless between the date of the speech against Meidias and the date of our treatise, 329-5 B. C., the law was changed in order to render impossible such an undeserved misfortune as befell Straton. The description of the division of duties among the *στράτηγοί* in ch. 61 is another instance where, in describing *ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας*, the author brings the treatise fully down to date without mention of the fact that the present arrangement is a very recent one.

4. With regard to the jurisdiction of the *δαιτηταί* and their rela-

tion to other magistrates, the account in the text clears up some questions of long standing, but raises others. With the exception of suits that were required to be determined within one month, it appears from ch. 53 and 61 that private suits involving more than ten drachmas went from the hands of the Forty before a *δαιτητής*. The only essential difference of procedure between suits involving citizens alone and those involving a non-citizen resident was that the former were brought before the Forty at first, while the latter were brought first before the Polemarch and by him referred to one of the ten divisions of the Forty. But what suits are *ἔμμηνοι δίκαι* and how are they treated? The list given in ch. 52 is *προικός, εἰάν τις ὀφείλων μὴ ἀποδῶ, κἂν τις ἐπὶ δραχμῇ δανεισάμενος ἀποστερῇ, κἂν τις ἐν ἀγορᾷ βουλόμενος ἐργάζεσθαι δανείσθαι παρά τινος ἀφορμὴν* [apparently these would be called *δίκαι ἀφορμῆς*], further, *αἰκείας, ἑρανικαί, κοινωνικαί* [perhaps suits growing out of partnership agreements; Lipsius, *Klagen gegen Corporationen*], *ἀνδραπόδων καὶ ὑποζυγίων, τριηραρχίας* and *τραπεζιτικά*. Of this surprisingly long list we are told that the *εἰσαγωγεῖς*, five in number, each acting for two tribes, *τὰς ἑμμήνους εἰσάγουσι δίκας*. The form of expression, with the article, makes the statement a general one, as if the list included all *ἔμμηνοι δίκαι*. It is true the author goes on to mention one other class of *ἔμμηνοι δίκαι* which belong elsewhere. Suits in which the tax-farmers (*τελώναι*) were involved were *ἔμμηνοι*, yet did not come before the *εἰσαγωγεῖς*, but remained in the hands of the *ἀποδέκται*, who, if the amount at stake did not exceed ten drachmas, were themselves competent to give final judgment, and if the amount at stake exceeded that sum, brought the cases before the *δικαστήριον*. But the whole context is such as to imply distinctly that this is an exception which proves the rule; in other words, that the exception is mentioned for the very reason that it is the only exception, and that all other *ἔμμηνοι δίκαι* belong before the *εἰσαγωγεῖς*. Now Pollux and Harpokration, although they omit most of those given by Aristotle as *ἔμμηνοι*, yet both include under *δίκαι ἔμμηνοι* the *δίκαι ἐμπορικαί*, which Aristotle omits. Pollux expressly states that they came under the jurisdiction of the *εἰσαγωγεῖς* (*οἱ τὰς ἑμμήνους δίκας εἰσάγοντες ἦσαν δὲ προικός, ἑρανικαί, ἐμπορικαί*). Lipsius meets this disagreement between Pollux and Aristotle by deciding that Pollux, although right in calling the *δίκαι ἐμπορικαί ἔμμηνοι*, is wrong in assigning them to the *εἰσαγωγεῖς*, since we know from ch. 59 of this treatise as well as from (Dem.) 33, 1 and (Dem.) 34, 45 that *δίκαι ἐμπορικαί* belonged before the

θεσμοθέται. Is not another solution of the difficulty more probable? The argument from silence is always to be employed with caution; and in this case the only question is, in which place has Aristotle allowed himself the omission. If he has omitted no *ἔμμηνος δίκη* from his list of those which the *εἰσαγωγεῖς* introduce, then he has omitted in both places where it is called for by the context, ch. 52 and 59, the statement that *δίκαι ἐμπορικαί* before the *θεσμοθέται* are *ἔμμηνοι*. But elsewhere in the same article (p. 46) Lipsius himself remarks upon the surprising way in which the recovery of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* increases our sense of the trustworthiness of the later grammarians and lexicographers when treating of legal antiquities. Again, on the following page, Lipsius calls attention to a like omission: "Die Liste der vor diese [*θεσμοθέται*] gehörigen Schriftklagen, bei welchen Parastasis zu erlegen war, wird gegen das im *Lexicon Cantabrigiense* und bei Harpokration bewahrte Bruchstück um die Klagen *συκοφαντίας* und *δώρων* bereichert. . . . Aber es fehlt eine Anzahl anderer Klagen, für welche die Gerichtsvorstandschaft der Thesmotheten durch Rednerzeugnisse feststeht (A. P. S. 78 f.)." And from this fact Lipsius draws the necessary inference that no conclusions can be based upon a failure on the part of Aristotle to mention particular complaints. We are certainly less likely to err in assuming that the positive statement of Pollux rests upon good authority, Aristotle or some one else, than in arguing from the omission of one word in so long a list. It thus becomes probable that this class of *ἔμμηνοι δίκαι*, after being brought first before the *θεσμοθέται*, as they had been before they were made *ἔμμηνοι*, were by them referred, in this period, to the *εἰσαγωγεῖς* for more speedy action. There is then a certain parallelism between this procedure and that followed with suits involving a non-citizen resident.

Again, with regard to *δίκαι αἰκείας*, we know from Dem. 37, 33 that they came before the Forty as *ἡγεμόνες*. Of course it is possible that between the date of the speech *πρὸς Πανταίνετον* and the date of our treatise the law was changed and *δίκαι αἰκείας* made *ἔμμηνοι*; and this is the solution adopted by Lipsius. But if the procedure with *δίκαι ἐμπορικαί* has been rightly described, then there is no ground for rejecting, but rather reason, from analogy, for accepting the conclusion that *δίκαι αἰκείας*, which certainly came originally before the Forty, continued after being made *ἔμμηνοι* to be brought before the Forty in the first instance, and were by them referred to the *εἰσαγωγεῖς*. The question then arises whether a like

course was not followed with the other *δίκαι ἔμμηνοι* which came before the *εἰσαγωγεῖς*. Certainly the *δίκαι προικός* were of a nature to come before the Archon, and it was held by Meier and others that such cases did come before the Archon, until the existence of the *εἰσαγωγεῖς* and their function with relation to *ἔμμηνοι δίκαι* was rendered indisputable. So too *δίκαι ἀφορμῆς, ἐρανικά, κοινωνικά, τραπεζικά,* and suits for damage wrought by slaves and draught animals, were all of a character to come naturally before the Forty; while suits growing out of the trierarchy, so far as they were between individuals merely, would seem to belong before the *στρατηγοί*, or, at the date of our treatise, before the *στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ τὰς συμμορίας*. It is to be observed that we have nowhere an express statement that the *εἰσαγωγεῖς* had original jurisdiction, or that they possessed any independent authority for deciding of themselves cases involving less than ten drachmas. Their name is appropriate to their function, and their place in the judicial system is more intelligible, on the supposition that they were so named because it was their sole duty to receive *δίκαι ἔμμηνοι* from other magistrates and see that they were carried through within the required period.

One step further. The *δίκη αἰκείας* against Konon had already been heard before a *δαιτητὴς κληρωτός* (Dem. 54, 26). If *δίκαι αἰκείας* were already *ἔμμηνοι*, we should then have an *εἰσαγωγεῖς* referring a suit to a *δαιτητὴς*; in that case there is justification for the statement of Pollux (VIII 93) quoted by Lipsius (A. P. p. 94) only for the purpose of discrediting it: *εἰσαγωγεῖς ἀρχῆς κληρωτῆς ὄνομα· οὗτοι δὲ τὰς δίκας εἰσάγαγον πρὸς τοὺς δαιτητάς*. As a universal statement this cannot, of course, be true, for not all complaints that were referred to the *δαιτηταί* were *ἔμμηνοι*; it is, however, by no means impossible, but rather probable, that *δίκαι ἔμμηνοι* in general were referrible to *δαιτηταί*, and were brought before a *δικαστήριον* only on appeal. I see no reason for Lipsius' assumption that thirty days were too short a time to permit such reference. It is to be remembered that the *ἀνάκρισις* before the arbitrator did not have to be repeated. The case might easily be brought before a *δικαστήριον* on the second or third day after the decision of the arbitrator was rendered; and even if we allow so much as ten days for him to come to a decision, the time still appears to be sufficient.

Finally, Aristotle's treatment of the subject of the *δαιτηταί* is a fair illustration of the manner in which the entire constitution is

handled in the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία. The treatise does not aim at absolute completeness. Details are often not given as fully as we could wish; now and then an omission, occasionally a downright slip, may excite surprise. The writer, in short, is not affected by the passion for *Vollständigkeit*, but sets forth the Athenian political and legal system in broad outlines. If we make due allowance for the difference in the complexity of the two subjects, and for the vast difference between the pioneer and the latest worker in the field, we shall find many points of resemblance between the treatise of Aristotle and the recent work of Mr. Bryce on our own commonwealth. The latter book is indeed a lineal descendant of the former.

THOMAS DWIGHT GOODELL.

V.—CRITICAL NOTES ON THE DIALOGUS OF TACITUS.

The notes and emendations here offered have grown out of the preparation of a critical and exegetical edition of the *Dialogus*.

FIRST PAPER.

1. Ch. I 14 H.: Ita non ingenio sed memoria et recordatione opus est, ut quae a praestantissimis viris et excogitata subtiliter et dicta graviter accepi, cum singuli diversas [vel easdem] sed probabiles causas afferrent . . . neque enim defuit qui diversam quoque partem susciperet, etc.

Accepi cannot be the correct reading here, for Tacitus uses this verb in the sense of *audire* only of information imparted by tradition or at second hand (cf. D. 12, 19; 28, 25; 30, 9; 40, 14, and so consistently in numerous passages of his later works), whereas *knowledge acquired directly from the living lips of the speaker*, as in the passage under notice, is expressed by *excipere* (cf. e. g. D. 2, 10; 15, 3; 29, 15; Ag. 45, 19; Hist. III 85, 5; IV 46, 26). I, therefore, write: E praestantissimis viris . . . EXcepi.¹ *Accipere*, being by far the more familiar word, easily took the place of *excipere*, and so we actually find the identical error in 2, 10, where EV² have *acciperem* for the genuine *exciperem* of the other MSS, and, especially analogous, Quint. X 1, 86, where the majority of our MSS reads: *ab* Afro Domitio iuvenis *accepi*, in place of the universally accepted reading: *ex* Afro . . . *excepi* (cf. Spalding ad loc.). The use of the same verb within a few lines is, of course, no more objectionable than the repetition of *diversus* immediately below, or that of *ingenium*, which occurs no fewer than five times in this very chapter (cf. also Nipp. ad Ann. I 81, and Joh. Müller, Beiträge z. Krit. des

¹E instead of *ex* is written advisedly, for out of 60 examples in Tacitus, in which this preposition precedes a word beginning with *p*, *ex* is found only a dozen times, but of these, *six* occur in the stereotype phrase *ex parte*, while in the other instances the MSS exhibit both forms.

²V = cod. Vindob. (cf. Scheuer, Bresl. Abth. VI 1 p.). In the designation of the other MSS I follow Michaelis. ω = omnes vel reliqui libri.

Tac. IV 11-18). The dread of repetition is chiefly a modern stylistic sentimentality; cp. the sensible remarks of Quint. X 1, 17 on this point.

As for the rest of the sentence, I unhesitatingly follow Lipsius in rejecting *vel eadem* as an interpolation, this being the only conjecture of the many that have been proposed which admits of a rational explanation of the origin of the corruption and, at the same time, completely satisfies the sense. *Veleadem* is the gloss of some ancient reader who believed the arguments of Maternus, Messalla and Secundus to be identical, which is perfectly true in so far as they all agree as regards the *actuality* of the decline of eloquence. Cf. 16, 12: *nec aequo animo [sc. Aprum] perferre hanc nostram pro antiquorum laude concordiam*. Aper, on the other hand, so far from offering any causes for this decline, vehemently denies its very existence. Hence it follows that he cannot be included among the *singuli*,¹ as has generally been maintained; in fact, if I mistake not, Tacitus intended to prevent this same misinterpretation by the addition of the next clause—*enim* having all the force of γάρ: "The several speakers advanced different, but withal plausible reasons for the decline of eloquence, nor was there also one wanting, as I would have you know, who took quite the opposite side."

Ch. 5, 11: *et ego enim quatenus arbitrum litis huius inveni, non patiar Maternum societate plurium defendi sed ipsum solum apud vos arguam, etc.*

et, ω, John *del. Pithoeus*, editt. *inveni, corr. Pithoeus* (*invenimus, Vahlen*); *inveniri*, ABCEV; *invenire*, D; *inveniri non puto, Andresen*; *arbiter—inveniri non potuit, John*; *quando te nunc inveni, Muretus*; *quia te nunc inveni, Ruperti, E. Wolff*; *licet litis huius i., Steuding*; *litis huius licet i., Philipp*; *iuvat inveniri, Ribbeck*; *at ego omnino inveniri spero, Hoerschelmann*; *nego enim alienum arbitrum inveniri quatenus, Baehrens*; *eos*, ABCEV; *ipsos*, D; *vos, Lipsius, Nipperdey, Peter, Halm, Vahlen, Joh. Müller*; *te, Muretus, Wolff*; *eum, Spengel, Michaelis*; *se, Andresen, Baehrens*; *nos, John*.

¹ A similar careless use of the word is found in ch. 14, 2, where *Tacitus*, be it observed, not *Messalla*, says: *suspiciatusque ex ipsa intentione singulorum altiorum inter eos esse sermonem*, but *Secundus* took no part in the debate referred to. Therefore, *singulorum* is inaccurate.

Andresen's (Act. Soc. Lips. I, p. 135 f.) and John's (Correspbl. f. d. Gelehrt. u. Real. Würtemb. 1886, p. 1 f.) remarks have, I think, in spite of W. Gilbert, Fleck. Jhrb., 133, p. 203 ff., irrefutably shown that Aper yields to Secundus' request to be excused from acting as judge in the contemplated debate.¹ If so, the clause beginning with *quatenus* must contain a negative idea. Andresen has supplied this by inserting *non puto*. But, as John justly remarks, we would in that case rather expect the fut. inf. He himself conjectures: *arbitrari . . . inveniri non potuit*, but this involves an additional change. A much easier emendation than either, and equally satisfactory to the sense here required, is to write: *NON inveni*, the similarity of the initial letters of *inveni* causing the omission of *ñ* (i. e. *non*).²

Eos, the reading of all but one of our MSS, was changed by Lipsius into *vos*, a conjecture which has met with no little favor. But as this reading would necessarily include the author of the *Dialogus* himself, it need not be considered seriously, for even if the writer had not kept himself studiously in the background, it is absurd to suppose that Aper would have asked his youthful follower to sit in judgment upon Maternus. *Te* is also out of the question, as this correction is based upon the erroneous assumption that Secundus assumed the role of *arbitrari*. *Eum* or *se* might possibly be defended with some degree of success. By far the most satisfactory suggestion, however, is that of John, who, running the gamut of possibilities, writes *nos*. The variant *ipsos* in D seems to me to have preserved a clue to the origin of the corruption. The archetype had it . . . *os*, the lacuna being erroneously supplied by the copyists.

Ch. 6, 30: *nam in ingenio quoque sicut in agro, quamquam alia diu serantur atque elaborantur, gratiora tamen quae sua sponte nascuntur.*

¹ It may be added in confirmation of this view, that the author of the *Dialogus* would have proved himself a very clumsy artist indeed, had he set all this machinery at work only to abandon it, for Secundus does not appear in the capacity of judge at all. The little introductory episode is, however, highly appropriate for bringing the attitude of the interlocutors into bold relief, and this was doubtless Tacitus' intention.

² This emendation has been *accidentally* anticipated by Gerber-Greef, *Lex. Tacit.*, where s. v. *enim* our passage is thus quoted, and without comment: '*arbitrum litis non inveni, non patiar*,' with the omission of *huius*, whereas ss. vv. *arbitrari, inveni, hic, lis*, and *non*, their citation agrees with the vulgate text!

alia, ABEV; om. CD, *Steuding* (Fleck. Jahrb. 135, p. 627); utilia (utiliora), *Ernesti*; solidiora ser. diuque elab., *Peerkamp*; solidiora quae ser. atque elab., *Andresen*; dulcia quae industria, *Weinkauff*; diurtuna ser., *Baehrens*; valida diu ser., *Cornelissen*.

A few scholars, ignoring the significant omission of *alia* in two MSS, have endeavored to defend the otherwise inexplicable reading on the analogy of a well-known Greek idiom. This construction does not, however, occur elsewhere in Latin, nor does one quite understand why Tacitus should in this instance have had recourse to it, especially since no other Grecisms (with the possible exception of *tamquam* = ὥς, for which cp. Wölfflin, Phil. 24, p. 115 f.) are found in the *Dialogus*. *Steuding* regards *alia* as an interpolation, but this leaves the *quamquam* clause without a subject and a predicate,¹ not to mention the intrinsic improbability of an insertion of a word which can only be explained on the assumption of a Grecism!

It were also an easy task to refute the emendations given above, which destroy the obvious sense of the passage and depart too far from the MS reading; but refutation becomes unnecessary the moment it is observed that *alia* is nothing more nor less than the corruption of a dittography of *diu*, the *d* being mistaken for *al*, just as in the following very analogous instances we find a confusion between *d* and *ol*: 21, 18, *reddent* in CD for *redolent*. In 33, 10 *solum* was corrupted into an inexplicable *dum*, ABCDEV (*tantum*, which Ritter and Halm prefer to Dronke's emendation, does not explain the corruption). So, again, according to Haupt's ingenious suggestion (*Opusc.* III 47) *victor violens* in Hor. Sat. I 10, 37 should read *victo. ridens*, and according to Andresen *induerit* (in 6, 18) arose out of an original *voluerit*. The parent MS of CD (on their intimate relationship cf. Scheuer, l. c., p. 17 ff.) recognized the *diu* as a dittography, and therefore omitted it; the archetype of the other MSS, however, mistook *diu* for *alia*, hence our variants.

The *alia* being thus disposed of—and with its omission all conjectures and interpretations based upon it fall to the ground—it

¹ The bold ellipsis of a positive to be supplied as a predicate from a following comparative seems to occur but *once* in Tacitus, and that in one of his very latest books, Ann. 15, 1: Tiridates quoque regni profugus per silentium [sc. gravis] aut modice querendo gravior erat. Even if the later works did contain more examples of this construction, it would still be inadmissible in the *Dialogus*.

remains to emend the incomplete sentence in a way that will bring out its obvious meaning without doing violence to the text. Both of these prerequisite conditions are fully complied with, if we read: *quamquam quae diu serantur atque elaborentur grata, gratiora tamen quae sua sponte nascuntur. Quae* (i. e. *q*; or *q̄*.) was easily dropped after *quamquam* (i. e. *quamq̄*; cf. D. 18, 27; 32, 4. 19). For similar omissions cf. e. g. ch. 3, 2, *ipsum quem* for *ipsumque quem*. 39, 25: *quoque qui*, *ω*, *quoque*, D; cf. also Buecheler, Rh. Mus. XI 512 f. "It is with the mind as with the field, for, while those things which are sown and cultivated for a long time are pleasing, yet more pleasing are those that grow of their own accord."

Ch. 7, 10: *Tum mihi supra tribunatus et praeturas et consularatus ascendere videor, tum habere quod si non in alio oritur nec codicillis datur nec cum gratia venit.*

alio, ABCDE *aliquo*, Ritter, Peter, Halm, Wolff; *si non in animo*, Freinsheim, Joh. Müller; *si non in ipso*, non *ab alio*, Nipperdey; *si*, del. Michaelis; *quod in se non in alio*, Rutgersius; *in ipso*, Ernesti; *in naturali oboritur*, Doederlein; *ingenio*, Seebode; *in nobis*, Schopen; *sola indole*, Ribbeck; *intus*, Usener; *numine aliquo*, Sillig; *naturale*, Baehrens; *natalibus paritur*, Andresen; *proelio*, Dryander; '*quod—oritur*,' del. olim Ritter.

Quot homines, tot sententiae! With the exception of *aliquo*, however, none of the above enumerated conjectures possesses the slightest paleographical probability; they are only valuable in so far as they indicate the impossibility of a satisfactory explanation of the MS reading. Ritter's emendation, though certainly an easy one, is nevertheless untenable, because the pronoun *aliquis* is altogether too indefinite a word in this place, and hence even its supporters are compelled to invest the preposition *in* with an emphasis which it never has. I conjectured *alvo*; an emendation, as I subsequently learned, long ago anticipated by Pithoeus, though persistently ignored since the days of Lipsius, who contemptuously dismisses it, as being quite unintelligible.¹ *Alvus* is, however, frequently used in the sense of *uterus*, with or without *matris*, this addition being superfluous where the context or some word (as *oritur* in the present instance) precludes any possible

¹ Baehrens also casually mentions the conjecture in his critical commentary, but omits it in his *adnotatio critica*.

ambiguity. Cf. Plaut. Stich. II 1, 15; Cic. pro Cluentio I 12; de div. I 20; Hor. A. P. 340. The thought, moreover, is exactly paralleled by a passage in the Dial. 29, 10: *huius urbis vitia paene in utero matris concipitur*. Cf. also Pall. IV 12: *vixdum concepta in alvo vitiatur*.¹

Ch. 8, 4: *Ausim contendere Marcellum hunc Eprium . . . Crispum Vibium (. . . utor) . . . non minus esse in extremis partibus terrarum quam Capuae aut Vercellae, ubi nati dicuntur*.

minus, ABCDEV, *Peter*; *notos post minus ins.*, *Ursinus*, *Nipp.*, *Halm*, *Joh. Müller*, *John*, *Wolff*; *post utor*, *add. Sauppe*, *Michaelis*; *post esse*, *Lipsius*; *illustres post minus*, *coll. Ribbeck*, *Andresen*, *Baehrens*; *minoris*, *Rutgersius*.

The constant shifting in position which the word, first suggested by Ursinus, had to undergo, is a tacit acknowledgment, on the part of the critics, of the very unsatisfactory character of the conjecture. A far more plausible correction, and one that suits the context equally well (Peter's defence of the MS reading need not be considered seriously), is to suppose that *minus* is simply a corruption of *MINORES*, the word having been abbreviated into *miñ*. For *minores* in the sense of 'inferior in rank, renown or intellect' cf. Dial. 21, 26: *nam in orationibus minorem esse fama sua (sc. Brutum) etiam admiratores eius fatentur*, Ann. I 13: *Gallum Asinium avidum et minorem*, *ibid.* XVI 8: *mox Neronem . . . quasi minores evasere*, XVI 20. Especially frequent in Quint., e. g. I 2, 10: *minores . . . praeceptores*, II 3, 1: *pueros non continuo tradendos eminentissimo credunt sed apud minores aliquamdiu detinent*, II 5, 19: *illos minores [sc. scriptores] quia facilius eorum intellectus videbatur, probaverunt*; cf. also VI 3, 67; X 1, 60, 74, and Hor. Ep. I 1, 106; II 1, 183.

Ch. 12, 15: *nec ullis aut gloria maior aut augustior honor*.

The lacuna after *maior*, indicated in our MSS, has been filled out by Ritter by the addition of *erat*, while Michaelis suggested *gloria mortalibus maior*. The latter insertion cannot be accepted,

¹All still existing doubt as to the certainty of Pithoeus' emendation is now dispelled by Scheuer's accurate collation of the Cod. Vindobonensis, which reads *albo*, i. e. *alvo*. The confusion between *b* and *v* is too common to call for illustrations. Cf., however, e. g. Dial. 7, 4; 8, 2; 16, 2, 4; 20, 22; 25, 33 M. If *albo*, we may add, had been due to some old conjecture, its author would scarcely have spelled the word incorrectly.

because *gloriamor* in our MSS arose out of *gloria maior* by metathesis, a very common source of error; cf. Vahlen, Berl. Prooem. 1881, p. 1 ff. I think Tacitus wrote: 'gloria maior erat mortalibus aut a. h.' or simply maior mortalibus, with the omission of the copula.

Ch. 13, 3: licet illos certamina et pericula sua ad consulatus evexerint.

ad, *corr.* Lipsius; et, ω [ad opes] et consulatus, *add.* Ritter; et [ad sacerdotia (*vel* praeturas)] et consulatus, *ins.* Vahlen.

An enumeration of some of the positions which an orator might hope to attain through his eloquence decidedly weakens the force of the passage. I, therefore, emend the MS reading by inserting VEL (written t) before ad consulatus.

Ch. 13, 15: quod adligati omni adulatione.

The majority of critics refuse to accept Walther's emendation *omni* (cū, ABE; cum, CDV). It is, however, perfectly certain, as a glance at the variants in ch. 2, 15 might have shown: omni eruditione (omni, CEV; cū, ABD), for here no other reading is possible. In 26, 31, cod. C has *in omne* for *in commune*, the similarity of the compendium for omne and commune misleading the scribe.

Ch. 13, 23: Me vero *dulces* ut Vergilius ait, *Musae* . . . in illa sacra illosque fontes ferant.

illa—illos, bCDEV; ista—istos, AB; sacra [loca], *add.* Helmreich; [loca] sacra, *John olim*; sacra [nemora], *Mähly*; secreta, *E. Wolff*; illasque frondes, *Haupt* (Op. I 194), *Michaelis*, *Nipperdey*; illosque ad, *Ritter*, *Andresen*, *Halm*, *Müller*, *Wolff*; ad illa—illos, *Baehrens*.

Two objections have been urged against the genuineness of our MS reading. It will be necessary to examine them, as they have led to what I believe to be an unwarranted tampering with a perfectly sound text. In the first place, we are assured that *sacra* is not used in the *local* sense of 'shrines' or 'sacred precincts,' the meaning required here, and the dictionaries, it is true, do not cite any instances. Nevertheless, examples are by no means lacking, even in Tacitus, where the word, as shown by the context, can either have no other signification or where there is, at least, no obstacle to its being so interpreted. Cf. Tac. Hist. III 33: cum

omnia *sacra* profanaque in ignes considerent solum Mefitis *templum* stetit ante moenia *loco* seu numine defensum; Ann. I 54, 4: profana simul et *sacra* et celeberrimum templum . . . *solo aequantur* (also quoted by John, Fleck. Jahrb. 1888, p. 572); Ann. I 79, 6: qui *sacra* et lucos et aras patriis amnibus dicaverint; Pers. Prol. 7: ipse semipaganus | ad *sacra* vaturn carmen affero nostrum; Prop. IV 1, 1: Callimachi Manes et Coi *sacra* Philetæ | In vestrum, quaeso, me sinite ire nemus.

The other objection is best stated in words of Haupt l. c. "An die quellen der Musen zu denken hat den herausgebern genügt, aber ein bad in diesen quellen will Maternus doch schwerlich nehmen und die wohlfeile kunst (!) mit der man etwa *in fontes* anders erklären möchte, verdient keine ernstliche Berücksichtigung." He thereupon conjectures, on the analogy of 'nemora et lucos' immediately preceding, *illasque frondes*, which he styles "eine überzeugende Verbesserung." And so it has seemed to Michaelis, while subsequent editors, with the exception of Peter, have at least been so far convinced as to admit the existence of a corruption in the text, although they prefer Ritter's conjecture as an easier solution of the alleged difficulty. I have, however, even in the face of this unanimity of opinion, no hesitation in saying that the great critic never conceived a more worthless emendation, and one based on more fanciful grounds, for even supposing his point to be well taken, *frondes* would still have nothing in its favor, as the shrines of the Muses and a neighboring spring are invariably associated (cf. Paus. IX 29, 3; Plut. de Pyth. orac. 17; Livy I 21; Juv. III 13: nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur, with Mayor's note ad loc.), so that we have no right to destroy the traditional collocation in our passage under any circumstances. Nor has the insertion of *ad* any better justification, for if, as is contended, *in fontes* could only mean "into the fountains," one's sympathy is strongly aroused for the dreadful fate of the poor individuals introduced in the following passages: κ 107: ἡ μὲν ἀρ' ἐς κρήνην κατεβήσεται καλλιέεθρον, and Prop. III 6, 17: semper *in Oceanum* mittit me quaerere gemmas | et iubet ex ipsa tollere dona Tyro; cp. also K 366: φεύγων ἐς νῆας, i. e. ad castra navalia; O 420: πῦρ ἐς νῆα φέροντα, i. e. adferentem. In all these cases *in* or *ἐς*=ad, towards, *Germ.* 'an,' and this may be the meaning it has in the passage under notice. Inasmuch, however, as the sanctuaries of the Muses were always located on the top of mountains, I prefer to take *in* in the sense of 'up towards,' a significa-

tion which *in* frequently has; cf. e. g. Dial. 10, 20: in arcem ferat; 19, 16: in caelum laudibus ferebatur (certainly not "into" the citadel or "into" heaven); Prop. V 8, 13: si fuerint castae, redeunt in colla parentum (the 'parentes' would unquestionably have preferred the "wohlfeile kunst das *in* anders zu erklären," in this case); Cic. de orat. III 10, 25: tamquam in aram confugitis (so also Nep. Paus. 4, 5). The insertion of *ad* after *illosque* is impossible on stylistic grounds, for the anastrophe of the preposition is confined to the later works of Tacitus (Wölfflin, Phil. 25, 116), and even there the preposition *ad*, in anastrophe, is of extreme rarity, except in certain formulaic expressions such as quem ad modum, while after a demonstrative pronoun, *ad* in anastrophe occurs but once! (cf. H. C. Maué, De praep. *ad* apud Tac. usu, p. 71; A. Gerber, Progr. Glückstadt, 1871). We may therefore conclude that neither Ritter's nor Haupt's "überzeugende Verbesserung" "verdient eine ernstliche Berücksichtigung."

Ch. 13 ext. I read as follows: nec plus habeam quam quod cui velim relinquere, quandoque fatalis et meus dies veniet, statuar tumulo non maestus et atrox sed hilaris et coronatus et pro memoria mei nec consulat quisquam nec roget.

Relinquere quandoque enim veniat (veniet, bp) statuarque, ω; relinquere: quandoque enim . . . statuar, *Hess*; relinquere: quandoque . . . statuarque, *Vahlen*; rel. (quandoque enim—veniet) statuarque, *Halm*, *Peter*, *Andresen*; quandoque cient fata licet meus dies veniet, *Baehrens*; [quandoque—veniet], *del. Ritter*, *glossema Christiani statuens*; enim, *del. Nipperdey*, *John*, *Wolff*; quandocunque, p; quandoque olim, *Steiner*, *Michaelis* (*olim* is, however, never used of the future in Tacitus); quando quidem, *coni. Halm*; venerit, *Ernesti*.

The almost obstinate persistency on the part of critics in taking *quandoque* in the sense of *aliquando* or *quandocunque* has been the chief cause of the innumerable misinterpretations and emendations to which this passage has given rise. Everything becomes perfectly clear, if we regard *quandoque* = *et quando*. *Quando* as a temporal conjunction is chiefly poetic (Aen. 6, 138); it is, however, according to Wölfflin's observation (Phil. 25, p. 119 f.), also used in prose whenever the style strikes a higher tone, 'bei gehobener Stimmung,' which is the case here; cf. e. g. Germ. 33; Hist. I 87. The confusion possibly arising out of *quandoque* and

quando-que is no greater than that of quoque=etiam and quo-que, examples of which are very numerous; cf. e. g. Dial. 8, 15. 37, 35. 36; Plaut. Poen. 1235; Cic. de off. I 2, 6; Sall. Cat. 23, 4; 58, 4; Jug. 30; Suet. Aug. 18. *Enim* is a gloss, as John has shown; *et* has the meaning of *etiam*, while the omission of *que* after *statuar* is *logically* called for by the context, the verb being necessarily in the same mood as the following optatives. "Let me not possess more wealth than what I can bequeath to whom I please, and when my final summons too shall come ('und wenn auch mein Sterbestündlein schlägt'), then let me stand upon my tomb not sorrowful and fierce of countenance, but joyful and laurel-crowned, and let no one either offer resolutions to my memory in the senate or send petitions to the emperor." With the thought we may also compare a line of Livius Andronicus ap. Gell. III 16, 11, which has, so far as I am aware, been overlooked by the commentators: 'Quando dies adveniet, quem praefata Morta est.'

Ch. 14, 14: Me vero, inquit et sermo ipse infinita voluptate affecisset atque id ipsum delectat, etc.

Et—atque is an intolerable solecism (cf. Hand, Turs. I 529, 5; Madvig, de fin. p. 388³, and Dräger, Hist. Synt. II 81², is practically of the same opinion). Halm's proposition to omit *et*, a mere dittography of the preceding *-it*, solves the difficulty very neatly. Nevertheless, a conjecture of Andresen's (Act. Soc. Lips. I, p. 141 f.) has met with far greater favor. On the supposition that *sermo* must here have the restricted signification which Secundus gave to it a few lines previous, where he draws a distinction between the *sermo* of Aper and the *oratio* of Maternus, Andresen contends that Messalla, courteous gentleman that he is, would not have slighted Maternus by not also mentioning his splendid contribution to the debate just closed, and he therefore writes: *et sermo iste et oratio infinita voluptate affecisset*.

Now, in the first place, there is absolutely no valid reason why Messalla must have used *sermo* in a different sense from what it had just been employed in l. 4: *suspiciatusque . . . altiore inter eos esse sermonem*, i. e. discourse, conversation, debate. Besides—and this is fatal to the emendation—the addition of *et oratio* necessarily involves the further change of *affecisset* to *affecissent*, for we never find in Tacitus a verb in the singular as the predicate of two substantives joined by *et—et*. But even if instances

of this inconcinnity were found, it could only be justified on the ground that one of the subjects is entitled to the greater emphasis, but this would in our case be open to the identical objection which had caused Andresen to insert *et oratio!*

For *ipse*, the reading of our MSS, Halm's *iste* has generally been accepted. I prefer *ille*, for the delicate irony which John, e. g., discovered in the use of *iste* here, is not apparent to me, and would in any case be altogether out of place in this passage. In the reading of the pronouns *iste*, *ille*, *ipse*, an editor must solely be guided by their well-established usage in Latin, the MSS—and the MS of the *Dialogus* notably so—being generally most unreliable witnesses, for the confusion between the various forms of these three pronouns is incredibly frequent. The error was unquestionably due to an abbreviation, e. g. Dial. 17, 17 *illum*, EV *ipsum*, CD *istum*, AB (so consistently), i. e. *i^m* or *i*, as we find it in ch. 19, 4 of cod. D, where AB write *ista* and bCDEV *illa*.¹

Ch. 15, 5: cum oblitus et tuae et fratris tui eloquentiae neminem hoc tempore oratorem esse contenderes[antiquis]eoque credo audacius quod . . . non verebaris, etc.

antiquis, *del. Acidalius, Nipp., Baehrens, Wolff*; prae antiquis, *coni. Halm olim, Michaelis*; parem antiquis, *Lipsius, Halm**; atque id eo—*Lipsius, Andresen, Wolff*; si conferretur antiquis, *Joh. Müller*.

The context as well as the pregnant use of *orator* in the *Dialogus* as applicable only to the speakers of the past (cf. e. g. ch. 14, 16; 26, 17; 30, 28; 32, 9), whereas 'horum temporum disertis, causidicis et advocatis et patronis et quidvis potius quam oratores vocantur,' shows that *antiquis* is altogether superfluous, not to mention that it is not even intelligible as it stands. The word is nothing but a gloss which subsequently found its way into the text, and it owes its origin, as John ingeniously suggests, to some ancient reader who took *contendere* in the sense of *comparare*. But if this be so, the above emendations necessarily collapse, the foundation upon which they are all based being thus taken away. Besides the omission of *antiquis*, the sentence requires a conjunction after *eo*, an asyndeton being quite out of place. I therefore read

¹ The attempt of Binde (de Taciti Dialogo Quaest. Crit., Berlin, 1884, p. 23 ff.) to determine the genuine readings on the basis of the alleged superiority of the X class (A and B) of MSS involves a fatal *petitio principii*.

eoQUE. The que, i. e. \bar{q} was easily omitted, owing to the similar sound of the letter immediately following. Cp. D. 41, 12.

Ch. 17, 23: proximo quidem congiario ipsi vidistis plerosque senes qui a Divo quoque Augusto . . . accepisse congiarium narrabant, ex quo colligi potest et Corvinum ab illis et Asinium audiri potuisse [nam Corvinus in medium usque Augusti principatum, Asinius paene ad extremum duravit], ne dividatis saeculum, etc.

Corvinus—Asinius, ω . Asinius—Corvinus, *Borghesi*, Opusc. I, p. 410, *Nipperdey* (R. M. 19, 280 ff.); extremum *pro* medium, *coni. Nipperdey*.

The reading of our MSS has long been admitted to be corrupt, for it involves a gross historical error, an error, too, that cannot be attributed to the author, as he shows himself fully conversant with the biographical detail both of Corvinus and of Pollio (cf. John, Correspbl. (Separatabd.) I, p. 8 ff.) Messalla Corvinus was born in 64 B. C. and died 8 A. D.; Asinius Pollio was born 76 B. C. and died 5 A. D. Now, inasmuch as Tacitus dates the beginning of the principatus of Augustus from the year 42 B. C. (cf. Dial. 17, 10; Ann. I 9), Corvinus, according to our text, must have died as early as 14 B. C., Asinius surviving him!

Borghesi endeavored to do away with this difficulty by transposing the names, an emendation that has met with general favor, and yet the absurdity remains precisely the same, for now Asinius, in place of Messalla, is relegated to the realms of shade long before his time.

Clinton proposed another remedy involving no change at all, but simply a different interpretation of *durare*, which has been and is still generally taken in the sense of *perducere vitam*, which it has in one or possibly two passages in Tacitus: Ann. III 16: narratum ab iis qui nostram ad iuventutem duraverunt, and Agr. 44: non licuit *durare in hanc* beatissimi saeculi *lucem*, but this is the by no means evident conjecture of Acidalius for the perfectly defensible *in hac luce* of the MSS. Clinton understood *durare* to signify the period up to which Asinius and Corvinus remained before the public as orators! But *durare* as a synonym of *florere* never occurs, and to force this meaning into our passage is pure exegetical sleight-of-hand, in violation of semasiology. Quod volunt, credunt. Unfortunately, moreover, we happen to know that Messalla Corvinus proposed in the senate chamber in the year 2 B. C. that the title

of pater patriae be given to Augustus (cf. Suet. Aug. 58), which is, of course, incompatible with the statement in the text, even supposing *durare*=*florere*.

John, evidently seeing this discrepancy, thereupon proposed to solve the entire difficulty by simply combining Borghesi's and Clinton's suggestions. But this solution must also be rejected for the following reasons: 1. *Durare* cannot signify *florere* under any circumstances. 2. It is very suspicious to find this verb construed with two different prepositions within one small sentence, there being absolutely no conceivable ground for this display of syntactical versatility, the more so, when it is observed that Tacitus never uses *in—usque* in a temporal sense (cf. Wölfflin, Burs. Jahresb. 3, p. 775; Philol. 26, p. 139). 3. If "*Asinius in medium usque Augusti principatum . . . duravit*" were genuine, one does not understand why Tacitus added the following chronological detail in ch. 38, 19: *exceptis orationibus Asinii quae heredibus Urbinae inscribantur, ab ipso tamen Pollione mediis divi Augusti temporibus habitae*, for nothing can be more absurd than to suppose Aper to have imparted a piece of information to Secundus,¹ which from the passage just quoted must seem an act of supererogation. Now, a close examination of both passages will convince any one, I think, that the words in ch. 38, 19 are eminently suited to the context, while in our passage the statement is both superfluous and gratuitous, especially when it is clear that the words "*ex quo colligi potest et Corvinum ab illis et Asinium audiri potuisse*" have all the chronological precision necessary to permit Aper's hearers to appreciate the point which he desires to establish, but if so, it follows that the clause in 38, 19 is the original which furnished the model for the passage in ch. 17; and, if we finally again recall the insuperable external difficulties under which the clause 'nam—duravit' labors, we shall not hesitate to condemn it as an interpolation. The parenthesis being out of the way, the ellipsis implied before *ne dividatis*, which has repeatedly been misinterpreted, is now also more natural and easy.

Ch. 18 init.: *haec ideo praedixi, ut si quae ex horum oratorum fama gloriaque laus temporibus acquiritur, cum docerem in medio sitam et propiorem nobis quam Ser. Galbae aut C.*

¹ That 36 init.—40, 7 is part of the speech of Secundus will be shown at length in my introduction.

Carboni quosque alios merito antiquos vocaverimus, sunt enim horridi et impoliti et rudes et informes et quos utinam nulla parte imitatus esset Calvus vester aut Caelius aut ipse Cicero.

The reading *imitatus* contains so glaring an absurdity that it is almost incredible that critics who have been by no means slow in discovering flaws in many a perfectly sound reading in the *Dialogus* should have left unnoticed so manifest a corruption as this one. For who ever heard that Caelius or Calvus or Cicero imitated *ulla parte* the uncouth, rugged and unpolished style of any of their early predecessors?

The style of Caelius did indeed lack the perfect polish and idiomatic purity that was found in Calvus or in Cicero. And as Quint. X 2, 25 characterises his diction by the term *asperitas*, Aper's more elaborate criticism in 21, 14 f., making all proper allowance for his exaggerating tendencies, may not have hit very wide of the mark: quid? ex Caelianis orationibus nempe eae placent . . . in quibus nitorem et altitudinem horum temporum agnoscimus. Sordes autem reliquae¹ verborum et hians compositio et inconditi sensus redolent antiquitatem nec quemquam adeo antiquarium puto, ut Caelium ex ea parte laudet qua antiquus est. Nevertheless, this very passage rather suggests the inference that Caelius' unpolished style was due more to want of good taste or literary care than to any conscious imitation of what savored of antiquity, owing to an affected predilection for what was obsolete or antiquated, as was the case with Laelius (cf. Cic. Brut. 22, 83; 24, 93), and notably so with Asinius Pollio.

When we come to Calvus, the *imitatus* of our text is simply ludicrous, Calvus, of whom Cicero, his greatest rival for oratorical leadership, says in his Brut. 82, 253: *accuratius* quoddam genus dicendi et exquisitius adferebat genus quod quamquam scienter eleganterque tractabat *nimum tamen inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans metuensque ne vitiosum colligeret* . . . *Atticum* se, inquit, Calvus noster dici volebat. Quint. X 1, 115 calls his diction *castigata* adding *imitator* autem est Atticorum, which Seneca, Controv. VII 4, 6, confirms when he tells us of Calvus that "compositio quoque eius in actionibus ad *exemplum Demosthenis riget*." And yet we are asked to believe that Tacitus put

¹*Reliquae* is the evident emendation of Sorof (De codd. Aeschlyli, Berl. Diss. 1881, Thesis) for *regule* in ABD (illae, CEV₃). The corrupted reading grew out of a metathesis.

into the mouth of one of the interlocutors the assertion that this same orator *imitated*, partially at least, the genus dicendi of a Galba or Carbo, characterised by an accumulation of epithets, every one of which is, so far as Calvus is concerned, contradicted by Cicero's Brutus, the very work to which the author of the Dialogus is chiefly indebted for his material! Credat Judaeus Apella!

And what are we to say to the preposterous statement that Cicero himself was found among the imitators of these early orators! a statement refuted by Cicero's own words (cf. e. g. Brut. 90, 310), and by every line of his that has come down to us, although it may be readily admitted that the great orator did not attain to stylistic perfection at one bound. Cicero was a profound student of the history of Roman oratory, as his rhetorical works abundantly prove, and fortunately some of his criticisms on the style of the very men whom he is said to have imitated are still extant. Cf. e. g. Brut. 21, 82: *sed inter hos . . . sine controversia Ser. Galba praestitit sed nescio quomodo huius exiliores orationes sunt et redolentes magis antiquitatem quam aut Laeli aut Scipionis aut etiam ipsius Catonis, itaque exaruerunt, vix iam ut appareant.* De orat. III 8, 28: *asperitatem Galbae.* Brut. 27, 104: *nam et Carbonis et Gracchi habemus orationes nondum satis splendidas verbis sed acutas prudentiaeque plenissimas.* But such a clear recognition of the stylistic shortcomings of his early predecessors simply precludes conscious imitation. Outside of these deficiencies, however, Cicero always speaks of them in terms of intense *admiration*; aye, so exaggerated was this estimate that he lets Atticus rebuke him for it and confine it within more accurate limits; cf. Brut. 86, 295 ff. That his contemporaries shared this admiration, for it pertained to qualities independent of their style, must be inferred from Aper's language in 22 init.: *Ad Ciceronem venio cui eadem pugna cum aequalibus suis fuit quae mihi vobiscum est, illi enim antiquos mirabantur, ipse suorum temporum eloquentiam anteponebat.*¹ This furnishes the key to the emendation of the corruption. Tacitus, I feel convinced, wrote 'quos utinam nulla parte MIRATUS esset Calvus vester aut Caelius aut ipse Cicero.' Aper cannot understand how orators such as Galba, Carbo, Cato, etc., should, nevertheless, have elicited admiration, for, from his point of view, beauty of language and senten-

¹ This latter statement is, of course, even if it be authentic, not incompatible with a sincere admiration for his predecessors, as we have seen.

tious diction constituted the essential and prerequisite qualifications of the true orator, in both of which such men as Galba and Carbo were, of course, sadly deficient.

Mirari and *imitari* closely resemble each other in minuscule MSS, and they were accordingly confounded very frequently; cf. e. g. Ovid, *Her.* II 72; Quint. X 2, 7; Lucan, IX 807; Martial, I 39, 5; Servius, Verg. *Aen.* VIII 517 Th.¹

Ch. 20, 3: Quis nunc feret oratorem de infirmitate valetudinis suae praefantem? qualia sunt fere principia Corvini.

Fere or *ferme*, the form preferred by Tacitus in his later works, never has the force of an adjective, whether we take it in its usual sense or in that of *plerumque*, which it is supposed to have here. It is always an adverb, pure and simple. This being so, I feel convinced that OMNIA dropped out of the text, and I therefore write: qualia sunt OMNIA fere principia Corvini, an emendation which derives no little support from the following almost identical passage in Quint. IV 1, 8: si nos infirmos, imparatos impares agentium contra ingeniis dixerimus, *qualia sunt pleraque Messallae prooemia*, etc.² On the analogy of Ann. 3, 76, 4 *ferme cunctos proceres*, and Ann. 14, 20, 3 *ut cuncta ferme nova*, one might also be tempted to insert *cuncta* in place of *omnia*, were it not for the singular fact that this adjective, though frequent enough in Tacitus from the Agricola downwards, never occurs in the Dialogus except *once* in the formulaic or proverbial phrase *agunt feruntque cuncta* (Dial. 20, 8; cf. also Hist. I 2, 19 [cum delatores] *agerent verterent cuncta*). For the omission of *omnia* cf. e. g. Quint. X 1, 106.

Ch. 20, 6: praecurrit hoc tempore iudex dicentem et nisi aut cursu argumentorum aut colore sententiarum aut nitore et cultu descriptionum invitatus et corruptus est, aversatur.

The *ubertas*, not to say *abundantia dicendi* which is so characteristic a feature of the Dialogus, is perhaps nowhere more conspicuous than in the very numerous instances of tautological or at best pleonastic combinations of substantives, adjectives and

¹According to Cornelissen, the same confusion took place in Dial. 23, 4: quae tamen sola mirantur atque exprimunt. He therefore reads *im antur*, on the supposed analogy of Quint. X 2, 18. But this conjecture is refuted by the observation that Tacitus does not join synonymous verbs by *atque*. See below.

²This defence looks suspiciously like an answer to Aper's criticism; cp. also Quint. VI 3, 4 and Dial. 23 init.

verbs. Now, it is a very singular thing to observe, what has hitherto escaped notice, that Tacitus in the *Dialogus* always uses the conjunction *et* to combine two more or less synonymous verbs closely. Cf. e. g. 4, 3 *agitare et insequi*; 7, 8 *tueri et defendere*; 8, 24; 9, 16 *excudit et elucubravit*; 9, 17. 31; 11, 8; 17, 19; 17, 31 *agnoscere ac velut coniungere et copulare*; 22, 22; 26, 36; 30, 26; 32, 6 *scientia . . . nos ornat atque eminet et excellit*; 33, 9; 39, 24. Wherever, on the other hand, one of the closely connected verbs carries on the thought of the other, *atque*, which very often has a progressive or intensive force, takes the place of *et*. Cf. 6, 27: *serantur atque elaborentur* (sown and then cultivated); 15, : *inridere atque contemnere* (ridicule precedes contempt); 15, 12: *scrutetur ac reddat* (let him inquire and then furnish us with the results of his investigations); 23, 4: *sola mirantur atque exprimunt* (admiration leads to imitation). I have noticed but two exceptions, which, on closer inspection, however, admirably confirm the observation: 5, 14: *parere simul et tueri amicitias*, and 5, 29: *propugnare pariter et incessere*. Here one would certainly expect *atque*, were it not that the insertion of *simul* and *pariter* has the effect of making the action expressed by the two verbs appear simultaneous, coalescing, as it were, into one idea. But if this observation is true, then *invitatus et corruptus* cannot be the genuine reading, for so far from being tautological, the two verbs stand in the relation of cause and effect. An easy way out of this difficulty would be the substitution of *atque* for *et*, the two conjunctions being frequently confounded; cf. e. g. *Dial.* 18, 27; 21, 16 *Mich.* I hesitate to apply this remedy, however, because the verb *invitatus* itself seems out of place here. As the context shows, the stylistic qualities mentioned by *Aper*, however desirable or admirable they are generally considered to be, are here said to exert a *corrupting* influence upon the judges. Now *invitatus* in this figurative sense, as far as I have been able to discover, is used only of allurements of a harmless or beneficial nature, and hence frequently joined with *allicere*. This being so, I write with only a very slight change *VITIATUS et corruptus*. The identical collocation is found, e. g. in *Cic. pro Sestio*, 54, 115. The origin of the corruption is very apparent. The *in* is a dittography of the preceding *m* in *descriptionum*, just as in the precisely analogous passage in 9, 29, all our MSS read *suum ingenium* for the only genuine reading *suum genium*, and again, in 18, 6 one MS has *utinam in nulla* for *utinam nulla*. This error

once committed, the *i* was naturally dropped, the very familiar *invitatus* taking the place of *invitiatus*, which is no Latin word, nor are there examples lacking, if any be needed, of similar omissions of *i* in the 'inlaut.' Cf. e. g. Dial. 25, : antiquorum in all our MSS for antiquorum, and 39, s the cod. Farnesianus (C) has virum for virium.

Ch. 22, 23: quaedam vero procul arceantur ut iam oblitterata et OBSOLETA.

olentia, ω; exoleta, *Acidalius*; antiquitatem olentia, *Andresen*; situm olentia, *Th. Vogel*.

The reading of our MSS admits of no satisfactory explanation. E. Wolff, the latest editor of the *Dialogus* (Perthes, Gotha, 1890), has therefore taken the easy emendation *obsoleta* into his text, and both Andresen and P. Langen have given him their weighty approval. Under these circumstances, I feel warranted in drawing attention to the fact that this conjecture was proposed by the writer as early as 1888 (cf. *De Heroidum Ovidii codice Planudeo*, Berl. Diss. Thesis VII). On the use of *obsoleta*, cf. Cic. de orat. III 30, 9: oratio paullo obsoletior; ibid. III 37, 150: illa laus oratoris ut abiecta et obsoleta fugiat; in Verr. I 1, 31, 56: nimis antiqua et iam obsoleta videantur; Quint. IV 1, 58: ab obsoleta vetustate sumptum. *Obsoleta* is preferable to *exoleta* for three reasons: (1) It is an easier correction of *olentia*; (2) it retains the alliteration of which Tacitus is extremely fond, not only in the *Dialogus*, but in his later works as well (cf. Weinkauff's lists, p. 43 ff., and pp. 48-56; (3) it is metaphorically closely allied to *oblitterata*, a rhetorical device observable in so many of Tacitus' synonymous collocations.

Ch. 25, 10: sed quomodo inter Atticos oratores primae Demostheni tribuuntur, proximum autem locum Aeschines et Hyperides et Lysias et Lycurgus optinent, omnium autem concessu haec oratorum aetas maxime probatur, sic apud nos Cicero quidem ceteros eorundem temporum disertos antecessit, Calvus autem et Asinius . . . iure et prioribus et sequentibus anteponuntur.

The editors of the *Dialogus* have with singular unanimity rejected the first *autem*, objecting to its repetition before concessu. It is, however, intrinsically improbable that so totally superfluous a word as *autem* would have been inserted in this place, no motive for such an interpolation being conceivable. I believe the second

autem to be a corruption of TAMEN, due to metathesis or an illegible compendium. So in Tac. Ann. XIII 25, 14 some editors write *autem*, others *tamen*, the codex Mediceus reading either *au* (according to Orelli) or *tu*, which, however, generally stands for *tum*. In Dial. 41, 15, we find the same confusion, for there *autem* is unquestionably the genuine reading for *tamen*, CDEV; inde, AB, cp. Michaelis ad loc. Substituting *tamen*, Messalla's point is at once brought out with remarkable clearness, which *autem* entirely obscures. Although Demosthenes was considered *primus omnium*, and not *primus inter pares*, yet (*tamen*) his age was, by common consent, regarded as marking the culmination of Greek oratory, so the age of Cicero marks a similar climax in Roman eloquence, even though the contemporaries of Cicero were greatly inferior to him. Therefore, concludes Messalla, 'nec refert quod inter se specie differunt, cum genere consentiant.'

Ch. 29, 9: quin etiam ipsi (*malim* ipsi quin etiam) parentes non probitati neque modestiae parvulos assuefaciunt sed lasciviae et dicacitati per quae paulatim impudentia inrepat [et sui alienique contemptus].

The meaning of *sui alienique* is apparent from the following passages: Sall. Cat. 5, 4: alieni adpetens, sui profusus; ibid. 12, 2: sua parvi pendere, aliena cupere; Tac. Hist. I 4, 9: pecuniae alienae adpetens, sui profusus (a clear imitation of Sallust); Cic. de orat. I 38, 173: cum omnino quid *suum* quid *alienum*, qua re denique civis aut peregrinus, servus aut liber quispiam sit, *ignoret*, insignis est *impudentiae*. Illa vero deridenda arrogantia est in minoribus navigiis rudem esse se confiteri, quinqueremes aut etiam maiores gubernare didicisse.

Now, this signification cannot be made to suit the context, as Peter ad loc. has irrefutably demonstrated. The same scholar thereupon proceeds to argue that *sui alienique* can only be made intelligible by taking it in the sense of intellectual, not material, property, and he adds, without observing the fatal self-contradiction, "neben *alieni* kann *sui* nur der genetiv von *suum* sein"! But the neuter gen. *alieni* can never do duty for *aliorum* or *alienorum*, nor was Peter able to adduce a single parallel instance of this use. Again, it must be noted that Peter's interpretation is open to a psychological objection, for *impudentia* and *contemptus sui* are rarely found in combination, if not actually incompatible. The entire clause is an interlinear gloss of the very kind that one

might expect from a monkish scribe, partly suggested, perhaps, by the Ciceronian passage just quoted. The very position of the words seems also, in a measure, to confirm this suspicion, for a *predicate* verb in the *singular*, placed between two subjects (not proper names), seems to occur but *once* in Tacitus. Cf. Hist. III 10, 16: *namque et facundia aderat mulcendique volgum artes et auctoritas.*¹

Ch. 32, 13: *quod adeo neglegitur ab horum temporum disertis . . . ut ignorent leges, non teneant senatus consulta, ius civitatis ultro derideant.*

Ius civitatis is quite unintelligible. Commentators have, therefore, suggested to interpret the phrase in the sense of *ius civile*, as opposed to *ius gentium*, but this signification of *civitatis* is not found elsewhere, so that Wolff, who also adopts it, has had to take refuge in an imaginary and gratuitous "peculiarity of Tacitus" ("eine Taciteische Besonderheit")! Baehrens, as usual, cuts the knot by boldly substituting *civile* for *civitatis*. I have not the slightest doubt that Tacitus wrote: *ius SUAE civitatis*. Cp. Cic. de orat. I 40, 184: *haec igitur et horum similia iura suae civitatis ignorent. Suae* easily dropped out between *ius* and *civitatis*. So also in Quint. X 1, 100. *suae*, though essential to the context, is omitted in most MSS.

Ch. 35, 10: *in quibus non facile dixerim, utrumne locus ipse an condiscipuli an genus studiorum plus mali ingeniis afferant.*

Tacitean usage in disjunctive clauses seems to call for either "an genus studiorum an condiscipuli . . . afferant," or what is a more probable because an easier change—*afferat*.

Ch. 36, 2: *magna eloquentia sicut flamma materia alitur et motibus excitatur et urendo clarescit.*

The climax of this beautiful simile is totally destroyed by an intolerable tautology, for *clarescit* is but another expression for what had already been distinctly stated by *motibus excitatur*.

¹ The only other passage that might possibly be cited for the 'collocatio verborum' under notice is Dial. 7, 15, which is generally read: *quibus modo et recta indoles est et bona spes sui*. But apart from the fact that the two substantives are joined by *et—et*, not *et*, it is certainly significant that the MSS vary considerably in their readings [*modo recta et indoles* ACD, et *add.* B om. CV, est om. EV, sit Michaelis]. These variants rather point to the following text as the original: *modo recta est indoles et bona spes sui*.

What is needed to complete the thought, whether we take it in its metaphorical meaning or regard it as descriptive merely of a physical process, is the idea of *heat, ardor, "Gluth."* 'Fire is nourished by its material, it is fanned into a flame by breezes, and waxes warm in the burning.' That this is the proper sequence may be demonstrated by a passage from Cic. Brut. 24, 93, which will be readily recognised as Tacitus' model: Quem [sc. Galbam] fortasse vis non ingenii solum sed etiam animi et naturalis quidam dolor dicentem incendebat efficiebatque, ut et incitata et gravis et vehemens esset oratio; dein cum otiosus stilum prehenderet motusque omnis animi tamquam ventus defecerat, flaccescebat oratio . . . ardor animi non semper adest, isque cum consedit, omnis illa vis et quasi flamma oratoris exstinguitur.

The difficulty just pointed out vanishes at once, if for the objectionable *clarescit* we substitute, with a very slight departure from the MS reading, CALESCIT, an emendation, moreover, strongly confirmed by Dial. 22, 13: *tarde commovetur, raro incalescit*, where we observe the same progression of thought required in our passage and couched in almost identical language. Cp. also the frequent collocation *excitare et inflammare* (e. g. Cic. pro Pomp. 2 de Harusp. resp. 1, 19).¹

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

¹This had long been written when I came upon the following short note in Mähly's *Observ. de Drusi atque Maecenatis Epicediis deque Taciteo Dialogo Criticae*, Basle, 1873, p. 23: "*excidit ex comparatione flammae clarescit quam comparationem ut plenam et integram restituamus, ni fallor, urendo calescit.*" But the *only* reason here given for the emendation strikes wide of the mark, for *clarescit* is, on the contrary, very appropriate when applied to a flame. The weakness of Mähly's objection is unquestionably the reason why editors of the *Dialogus* have persistently ignored his conjecture. Under these circumstances, I felt warranted in again drawing attention to what I consider an evident and necessary emendation, especially as it was reached independently of Mähly, and on grounds which will, I hope, insure its general acceptance.

NOTES.

ON CALLIM. LAUACR. PALLAD. 93-97.

These verses are thus given in the MSS :

'Α μὲν ἀμφοτέραισι φίλον περὶ παῖδα λαβοῦσα (al. λαβοῖσα)
 μάτηρ μὲν γοερῶν οἶτον ἀηδονίδων
 ἄγε (al. ἄγε) βαρὺν κλαίουσα (al. κλαίοισα). θεὰ δ' ἐλέησεν ἑταίραν,
 καὶ μιν 'Αθαναία πρὸς τόδ' ἔλεξεν ἔπος,
 Δία γύναι . . .

This passage presents much to perplex, notably (1) the double μὲν (93, 94); (2) the metrical difficulty ἃ μὲν ἀμφοτέραισι. It has been altered in many ways: ἃ μὲν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέραισι Stephanus, ἃ μὲν ἔτ' ἀμφ. Reiske, εἶπε καὶ ἀμφ. Blomfield, ἥ καὶ ἐπαμφοτέραισι Passow, φᾶ μὲν ἄμ' ἀμφοτέρας δὲ Meineke, ἃ μὲν ἄμ' ἀμφοτέραισι Schneider.

The ἃ μὲν looks right, and is answered by θεὰ δ' in 95. But the second μὲν in 94, μάτηρ μὲν, is intolerable, and has been variously emended. The best correction seems to me to be μιν, as, before me, Schneider suggested in *Philol.* VI, p. 519. The order of the words is μάτηρ μιν ἄγε, γοερῶν οἶτον (probably a mistake for οἶκτον as Schneider prints) ἀηδονίδων βαρὺν κλαίοισα: for there is surely no necessity to suppose that Callimachus never used μιν, though Schneider, in his edition of 1870, following Meineke, banishes it, against *all* MSS, from five passages, two in the *Lauacr. Pallad.* 65, 96, three in the *Hymn to Demeter* 73, 75, 104, writing in *all* μιν, and retaining μὲν in 94 against his own earlier judgment. Against Schneider's view, I should suppose Callimachus to have written μιν in 94 of a male, in 96, νιν, of a female; for, though the MSS give μιν also in 96, it is hardly likely that so careful an observer of poetical proprieties would in 94 apply the same form to a youth, in 96 to a woman.

Returning to 93, ἃ μὲν ἀμφοτέραισι φίλον περὶ παῖδα λαβοῖσα, it is difficult to choose between ἐν ἀμφ. and ἄμ' ἀμφ. It might be said that the mother would naturally embrace her blinded child with both hands *at once*, to show the depth of her sympathy with his affliction. On the other hand ἐν ἀμφ. is more in keeping with the prevailing calmness and absence of exaggeration which mark the poem. Schneider's quotations, however (*Philol.* VI 517), of ἄμ'

ἀμφω from the Iliad (VII 255, XXIII 686, H. Cer. 15, ἀμ' ἀμφοτέρωσιν H. Merc. 39) may perhaps be thought to determine the question in favor of ἀμα.

I suppose, therefore, that Schneider was *right* in his earlier view (1851), *wrong* in his later (1870). Not only is it extremely likely that Callimachus would distinguish μιν from νιν, and (at least in the same poem) confine μιν to a masculine object, using νιν when he speaks of a female; but the sentence, as Schneider prints it in 1851, p. 519:

ἀ μὲν ἄμ' ἀμφοτέρωσιν φίλον περὶ παῖδα λαβοῖσα
 μήτηρ μιν γοερῶν οἶκτον ἀηδονίδων
 ἄγε βαρὺν κλαίωσα. θεὰ δ' ἔλεησεν ἑταῖραν κ. τ. λ.

may be added to the other instances of that involution of clauses which, as is well known, the Alexandrian poets affected. Theocr. XXIX 3, Epigr. XIX 1, Callim. fr. 445 οὐδ' ὅθεν οἶδεν ὁδεύει Θνητὸς ἀνὴρ, Epigr. XLIV 2. This is, I believe, the true explanation of the much disputed passage of Val. Flaccus V 685-7:

Donec et Aeeten inopis post longa senectae
 Exilia, heu magnis quantum licet, inopia, fatis!
 Nata iuuet, graiusque nepos in regna reponat,

where *inopia*, a fem. agreeing with *nata* and referring to Aeetes' daughter Medea, is *interjected* into the exclamatory clause *heu magnis quantum licet fatis!*

ROBINSON ELLIS.

ON PARMENIDES 162 A. B.

This passage Grote pronounces to him "hardly intelligible." The reader who consults Hermann's text or Jowett's translation will receive little enlightenment. In spite of its subtlety, however, the passage is not really difficult when we have once grasped the main thought, and it admits, I think, of easy emendation. It occurs in the middle of the sixth argument of Parmenides, that is, to adopt the technical divisions of the dialogue, in the first half of the third antinomy: on the negative hypothesis that the one is not, *εἰ μὴ ἔστι τὸ ἓν*, Plato is demonstrating the coexistence of contraries in the relative or cognizable one. In 160 E he has shown, by hypothesis, that we cannot affirm being ("is") of the one, although we may affirm "participation" in attributes.

He now attempts to prove, on the contrary, that such "participation" in attributes implicitly affirms being ("is"). The argument is based on the familiar ambiguity of the copula. Predication is impossible without the copula; and the copula "is" posits the subject as "existing." Premising thus much, I will give first the text of Hermann and Stallbaum, with the translation of Jowett, and then what I conceive to be the emended text with a somewhat closer version of my own. Hermann prints:

ἔστιν ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικε, τὸ ἐν οὐκ ὄν. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἔσται μὴ ὄν, ἀλλὰ τι τοῦ εἶναι ἀνήσει πρὸς τὸ μὴ εἶναι, εὐθὺς ἔσται ὄν. Παντάπασι μὲν οὖν. Δεῖ ἄρα αὐτὸ δεσμὸν ἔχειν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τὸ εἶναι μὴ ὄν, εἰ μέλλει μὴ εἶναι, ὁμοίως ὥσπερ τὸ ὄν τὸ μὴ ὄν ἔχειν μὴ εἶναι, ἵνα τελέως αὐτὸ εἶναι ᾗ. οὕτως γὰρ ἂν τό τε ὄν μάλιστα ἂν εἴη, καὶ τὸ μὴ ὄν οἷα ἂν εἴη, μετέχοντα τὸ μὲν ὄν οὐσίας τοῦ εἶναι ὄν, μὴ οὐσίας δὲ τοῦ εἶναι μὴ ὄν, εἰ μέλλει τελέως εἶναι, τὸ δὲ μὴ ὄν μὴ οὐσίας μὲν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι μὴ ὄν, οὐσίας δὲ τοῦ εἶναι μὴ ὄν, εἰ καὶ τό μὴ ὄν αὐτὸ τελέως μὴ ἔσται.

Jowett renders (his text cannot differ essentially from Hermann's, and his translation is apparently an attempt to render the German version in Stallbaum's note):

Then, as would appear, the one has no existence, for if it were not to be non-existent, but to admit something of existence into non-existence (or "to remit something of the existence of not-being") it would at once become being. Quite true.

Then non-existence, if it is to maintain itself, must have the existence of not-being as the bond of not-being, just as existence must have as a bond the non-existence of not-being in order to perfect its own existence; for the truest assertion of being and of not-being is when being partakes of the existence of the existent and of the non-existence of the existence of the non-existent—that is, the perfection of existence; and when the non-existent as non-existent partakes both of the non-existence of not-being and of the existence of being—that is, the perfection of non-existence.

With one or two easy transpositions, the insertion of *μὴ* in one place, its omission in another, and one change of *εἶναι* to *ὄν*, I would restore the passage as follows:

ἔστιν ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικε, τὸ ἐν οὐκ ὄν. εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἔσται μὴ ὄν, ἀλλὰ τι τοῦ εἶναι ἀνήσει πρὸς τὸ μὴ εἶναι, εὐθὺς ἔσται ὄν. Παντάπασι μὲν οὖν. Δεῖ ἄρα αὐτὸ δεσμὸν ἔχειν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τὸ εἶναι μὴ ὄν, εἰ μέλλει μὴ εἶναι, ὁμοίως ὥσπερ τὸ ὄν ἔχειν [δεῖ?] τὸ μὴ εἶναι μὴ ὄν, ἵνα τελέως αὐτὸ [ὄν?] ᾗ. οὕτως γὰρ ἂν τό τε ὄν μάλιστα ἂν εἴη καὶ τὸ μὴ ὄν οἷα ἂν εἴη, μετέχοντα τὸ μὲν ὄν οὐσίας

τοῦ εἶναι ὄν, μὴ οὐσίας δὲ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι μὴ ὄν, εἰ μέλλει τελέως εἶναι, τὸ δὲ μὴ ὄν μὴ οὐσίας μὲν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ὄν, οὐσίας δὲ τοῦ εἶναι μὴ ὄν, εἰ καὶ τὸ μὴ ὄν αὐτὸ τελέως μὴ ἔσται.

The text thus emended I would translate as follows, observing that it is necessary for clearness to eschew in such passages as this the misleading English "exist."

The one as non-being then has being, for if it is not to *be* non-being, but is to relax anything of its being in relation to not being (or preferably "is to remit anything of its being in the direction of not being"; cf. Republic, 479c) it will at once be being. Quite so.

It must, therefore, have as a bond of its not being its *being non-being* if it is not to be, just as being in order to really be being must have the not being non-being. For thus, and thus only, can being most completely be and non-being not be, namely, if they respectively participate, being in essence in order to be being and in non-essence in order not to be non-being, if it is to be entirely; non-being, on the other hand, in non-essence in order not to be being, and in essence in order to be non-being, if non-being in turn is to be not entirely.

I will now comment on text and version together. Much commentary will hardly be required. Manuscript evidence I have none, nor would it be of much value if we had it. Let the reader copy a few pages of the Parmenides and he will not be inclined to cavil at the assumption of a few transpositions or omitted particles. The proof of the reading given is that it makes sense and grammar of what was neither grammar nor sense.

In the first clause Jowett takes ἔστιν as copula and οὐκ ὄν as predicate. I take ἔστιν absolutely as the context requires, since it is existence that Plato is trying to fasten on the assumed non-existent, and τὸ ἐν οὐκ ὄν must then be, what it obviously is in 162 E, (τὸ ἐν ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐκ ὄν ἔστηκέ τε καὶ κινεῖται) the unum non-ens of the hypothesis.

The meaning of the next clause is, perhaps, made sufficiently plain by the distinction I have been careful to maintain between not being (μὴ εἶναι) and non-being (τὸ μὴ ὄν). Of the two renderings of πρὸς suggested—the first means "if non-being shall lose the copula that binds it to being in the sentence 'non-being *is* not being'"; the second means "if non-being in its aversion to any affirmative copula should even negative again the binding copula so as to yield the statement 'non-being cannot *be* not being'"; the

obvious thought thus subtly complicated is the same on either version. Non-being would contradict itself and become being. Jowett I do not understand.

The transposition I have made in the text after *ὁμοίως* makes the meaning clearer, but is perhaps not absolutely necessary. We may have here one of those hyperbata which are so remarkable a feature of Plato's later, or, as I prefer to say, more elaborate style. The change of *εἶναι* to *ὄν* after *τελέως* in the following clause, or the omission of *εἶναι* is absolutely required. Either is possible; cf. *ἔσται ὄν* just above and *εἴη* just below, both used for emphatic assertion of "existence." *εἶναι ἢ* cannot be construed.

In the following sentence *εἶναι* occurs with the genitive of the article four times. Jowett, probably following Stallbaum, construes each as a "possessive" genitive of the articular infinitive. I think we have here hitherto unnoticed examples of the consecutive or final infinitive. The construction is rare but not unexampled in Plato (cf. *Gorgias* 457 E, *Republic* 518 D). It is required here by the thought and by the grammatical impossibility of the other construction. The whole context shows how familiar final forms of expression are to Plato in this connection. The subject must be assumed to admit a certain predicate *in order to* a certain inference. The expression of this idea of finality is quite varied (cf. *ἵνα τελέως ἢ* above, *εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι* below, *εἰ μέλλει* in this sentence, and the striking example 141 E οὐδ' ἄρα οὕτως ἔστιν ὥστε ἐν εἶναι). Why may it not take the form of the final infinitive here? Surely the thought is that both being and non-being *in order to retain* their nature must admit so much of their opposites as is involved in affirmative and negative predication.

In any case the received construction is inadmissible. Throughout this part of the *Parmenides*, with his usual stylistic tact, Plato is careful to employ *φύσις*, *εἶδος*, *αὐτὸ τὸ ἐν* and similar phrases for particular essences, reserving *οὐσία*, *οὐσίας μετέχειν* and the like for the essence of existence generally.

The participation in *the essence* of a particular idea requires the article in Greek as well as in English. And the rule is not changed by the fact that we are here dealing with the essences of being and non-being. Plato himself speaks of the essence of non-being in the *Politicus* (286 B), and his phrase is *τῆς τοῦ μὴ ὄντος οὐσίας*. It is impossible to construe *μὴ οὐσίας τοῦ εἶναι μὴ ὄν*, as Jowett does, "of the non-existence of the existence of the non-existent." Adopting my construction, the reason for the slight

change I have made in the text is clear. If being partakes of essence in order to be being, its object in partaking of non-essence can only be not to be non-being. We must read *μη οὐσίας δὲ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι μὴ ὄν*, inserting *μη* before *εἶναι*. This *μη* can be easily taken from the succeeding line where it is superfluous. Non-being partakes of non-essence with a view to not being being—we must read *τὸ δὲ μὴ ὄν μὴ οὐσίας μὲν τοῦ μὴ εἶναι ὄν*, omitting *μη* before the last *ὄν*.

A further confirmation of the proposed reading may be found in the last chapter of the first book of the Prior Analytics. Aristotle is there discussing negative predication with reference to the distinction between *μη εἶναι τόδε* and *εἶναι μὴ τόδε*. In 51b³⁰ he draws up a list of four typical forms as follows:

<i>τὸ εἶναι ἀγαθόν</i>	. .	denoted by	A
<i>τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἀγαθόν</i>		"	B
<i>τὸ εἶναι μὴ ἀγαθόν</i>		"	Γ
<i>τὸ μὴ εἶναι μὴ ἀγαθόν</i>		"	Δ

After observing that everything is either A or B, but nothing can be both, and that everything is either Γ or Δ, but nothing can be both, he goes on to point out that B necessarily follows from Γ and Δ from A.

That is to say, he points out that *τὸ εἶναι μὴ ἀγαθόν* (or generalizing with Plato *τὸ εἶναι μὴ ὄν*) implies *τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἀγαθόν (ὄν)*, and that *τὸ εἶναι ἀγαθόν (ὄν)* implies *τὸ μὴ εἶναι μὴ ἀγαθόν (ὄν)*. And this is just our proposed reading of Plato, according to which *τὸ ὄν* partakes of *μη οὐσίας* in order *μὴ εἶναι μὴ ὄν*, and *τὸ μὴ ὄν* partakes of *μη οὐσίας* in order *μὴ εἶναι ὄν*. The received reading (*εἶναι μὴ ὄν* and *μὴ εἶναι μὴ ὄν* respectively) cannot be explained by Aristotle's scheme.

As this is a somewhat dreary and technical fable, I may be permitted to deduce one general lesson from it in conclusion. Studied in the light of a fair familiarity with Greek idiom and elementary logic, the Parmenides is neither a very difficult nor a very obscure writing. *τοῦτο λέγω, οὐδὲν ποικίλον* says Socrates reassuringly when his bewildered interlocutor suspects a deep mystery in his words, and *τοῦτο λέγει, οὐδὲν ποικίλον* is often the final word of the Platonist who endeavors to hold a middle course between the Scylla of neo-Platonic mysticism and the awful Charybdis of the statistics of *τί μήν*.

PAUL SHOREY.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF LATIN *cartilāgō*, ENGLISH *cartilage*.

In the following the attempt is made to justify the derivation of *cartilāgō* suggested in G. J. Vossius' *Etymologicon* (1662), p. 111: 'A *carunculago* vel *carniculago* lit. *cartilago*, mutatione literae et syncope qualis in *imago*, quod ex *imitago* ab *imitor*.'

Latin *carō*, gen. *carnis*, "flesh," is an *-en*-stem (Brugmann, II, pp. 324 and 330), and has a derivative in *-co-lo-*, "denoting something like the primitive" (Brugmann, II, §88), viz. *caruncula*,¹ "small piece of flesh." A derivative of *caruncula* would be *carunculāgō* (cf. *simila* "fine wheat flour": *similāgō* with the same meaning; *lumbus* "loin": *lumbāgō*; *plumbum* "lead": *plumbāgō* "blacklead"; etc.). The primitive Latin accent (Brugmann, I, §§679-680; Henry, p. 96, 1) was *cārunclāgō*. By regular syncope this form would become *carnculāgō* (Brugmann, I, §633; just as **mānusuetus* > *mānsuetus*, **quīnquedecim* > *quīndecim*, etc.), and then by assimilation of *nc* to *r* (*r* could, of course, not assimilate to guttural *nc*), *carntulāgō*, and this (by simplification of the consonant-group *rnt*, anomalous, I believe, in Latin) *cartulāgō*, *cartilāgō*, with the intermediate sound written *u* and *i* and common before labials and before *l* if a dental precede (Brugmann, I, pp. 43 and 91).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

GEORGE HEMPL.

¹After I had worked out the derivation of *cartilāgō* < *caruncula*, my attention was called by Prof. Minton Warren to the passage in Vossius, to which I have no access. Prof. Warren himself favors the derivation suggested in Lewis and Short.

²*Carnicula*, given in the dictionaries on the authority of Priscian, and from which, through **carniculāgō*, *cartilāgō* could as easily be derived, is no word; for Priscian simply says that *caro* : *caruncula* : *virgo* : *viruncula*; and that, as a nom. *carnis* = *caro* was also in use, the diminutive of it should be (*debet esse*) *carnicula* : *canis* : *canicula*.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, herausgegeben von HERMANN PAUL.
Strassburg, Trübner, 1889.

The new encyclopedia idea which was first represented in modern philology by Körtling and Elze, and improved upon by Gröber, finds its fullest development in Paul's Grundriss. As might be expected, Paul has excelled his predecessors both in the general plan and character of the work. The plan of the work preserves, in the main, due proportions. The most serious lack of proportion appears in the chapter on Dialects (q. v.). The editor's collaborators are, for the most part, happily selected and well known for excellence of work in their respective fields. Some German names, however, which are conspicuous for their absence, would have added dignity and ripe scholarship to this philological symposium; certain chapters must remain incomplete without their contributions. Students of Braune must deplore the absence of a most valuable chapter on the Old High German language which his pen might have furnished. Indeed, in our opinion, O. H. G., M. H. G., and N. H. G. should have had each a chapter to itself.

The first three chapters of the Grundriss are written by Paul himself, and contain much of the editor's richest scholarship.

In Abschnitt 1 the author discusses the various definitions of the term *philology*. Choosing finally as his own point of departure the following: "Philologie ist dem Wortsinne nach die Forschung, welche sich mit den Sprachdenkmälern abgibt. Ihr stellt sich die Forschung über die Denkmäler der Kunst und des Handwerks gegenüber" (S. 4), he proceeds to show the relation of philology to other departments of culture, and to emphasize the fact that the philologist must have a knowledge of *many related* subjects. The emphasis laid upon the close relations of language and literature should be graven upon the minds of all students of *either* subject. American students of *literature* particularly should take this to heart: "Der Literaturhistoriker bedarf so gut wie der Sprachforscher einer Einsicht in die allgemeinen Lebensbedingungen der Sprache. *Diese ist die Grundlage für die Beurteilung des Stils* (S. 6)."

Abschnitt 2 is a valuable and welcome contribution to the history of Germanic philology from the time of Charles the Great to the present. The chapters entitled 'Die Gestaltung der germanischen Philologie zu einer festgegründeten Wissenschaft' and 'Die Neuzeit' are a masterly presentation of the stages of development through which modern philology has grown to the stature of a recognized science. The Berliner and the Junggrammatiker alike turn almost instinctively to Paul's treatment of Lachmann and his disciples, curious, at least, to see what the mature Junggrammatiker has to say of the Berlin school. Even the most loyal of either school must recognize the justice of Paul's estimate of Lachmann's work (S. 88 ff.), where he approves, in the main,

Lachmann's 'recensio,' but regards with disapproval much of his 'emendatio.' Paul thinks Lachmann to have been misled by a preference for the difficult and abstruse, and particularly by his metrical theories.

More characteristically Pauline, perhaps, is Abschnitt 3, on 'Methodenlehre.' The author has already distinguished himself as a master in method by his *Principien*. The present article contains, besides the essence of his *Principien*, much of a suggestive character that will prove of inestimable value to students. As specimens cf. 'Interpretation,' 'Textkritik,' and parts of 'Literaturgeschichte' as the 'Verfasserfrage' and others.

In the next article, on 'Runes and Runic Inscriptions,' Sievers discusses briefly the age and distribution of runic writing, mode of writing runes and materials employed, the uses made of runes and the oldest runic monuments. In the chronological order of these monuments Sievers summarizes Wimmer's results. Next follows the discussion of the Old Germanic Runic alphabet and its origin. One of the most interesting questions connected with the runes must long continue to be that of their origin. On this point Sievers agrees with Wimmer: "Das Runenalphabet ist nach dem lateinischen Alphabet . . . bei einem der südlich wohnenden germanischen Stämme (natürlich an einer einzigen Stelle und—können wir getrost hinzufügen—von einem einzigen Manne) gebildet, und es hat sich von dort aus allmählich zu den andern verwandten Stämmen verbreitet." Sievers suggests: "Zweifelhaft mag es hingegen wiederum bleiben, ob die Entlehnung nicht früher stattgefunden hat als am Ende des 2. oder zu Anfang des 3. Jahrhunderts, wohin Wimmer sie verlegt." This we believe to be the more probable. The reference in Tacitus (*Germ. cap. 10*) is doubtless to a mode of runic writing *already long in vogue among the Germans*.

In the companion chapter to the above Arndt gives a brief but clear account of Latin writing. The sections on the origin of Latin script (capitals) and development of the uncial, cursive, semi-uncial will be especially serviceable to the student. For the Germanist, however, the article would have been more satisfactory if the treatment of the Carolingian semi-uncial and the post-Carolingian minuscule had been more elaborate.

'Phonetik' is the subject of the next article, which contains the mature results of Sievers' long and accurate study in this field. Most of the materials of this chapter are to be found in the author's *Phonetik*. Paragraphs on 'Sprachtakt und Wort,' 'Drucksilben und Schallsilben' deserve special emphasis. Under 'Lautwechsel und Lautwandel' the author demonstrates with characteristic clearness the impossibility of philology without phonetics. An introductory chapter on the history of phonetics as a science would have been of great service to the student.

Kluge's 'Vorgeschichte der altgermanischen Dialekte' is perhaps the most decidedly epoch-making chapter of the *Grundriss*. Here for the first time is presented a clear and comprehensive history of the Primitive Germanic dialects based upon comparative phonology. The nearest approach to such a history was the work of Noreen, to which Kluge duly acknowledges his indebtedness. It was a wise choice that assigned this difficult task to Professor Kluge, whose clearness of vision and lucid style of handling abstruse philological questions have found international recognition.

The 'Einleitung' discusses briefly the relation of Germanic to other members of the I. E. family and to the Finnish-Lappish languages. One need but compare Kluge's method with that of Förstemann (*Geschichte des deutschen Sprachstammes*) to appreciate the progress of Germanic philology during the last two decades. Beginning with Lottner's vocalic criteria (KZ. 7, 18), Kluge proceeds to the consideration of *vocabulary*, which he correctly regards as the most important evidence of the speech-relationship of the "European Indo-Germans," and claims that the *ö, ë, i*, are of value as criteria only in connection with the vocabulary. The author agrees with Leskien, that Johannes Schmidt's 'Wellentheorie' by no means supplants the 'Stammbaumtheorie.' Under Celtic relationship two interesting classes of words are distinguished: (1) those which have undergone the Germanic mutation, as Gallo-Lat. *dānum* (Prim. Celtic *dānos*), Germ. *tāna*; (2) those which are not separated from Celtic by the mutation, as Gallo-Lat. *carrus* (O. Ir. *carr*), O. H. G. *charro, charra* (*ch* of the O. H. G. form is, of course, the result of the *second* mutation). Kluge frankly acknowledges that in the case of (1) particularly it is difficult to decide whether *Urverwandschaft* or *nachbarlicher Austausch* is the explanation. The importance of Thurneysen's researches into accent as showing the close relationship of Celtic and Germanic speech is duly recognized. The section on Germanic-Roman relations could touch only the most general facts of this vast domain. The prominent feature of this paragraph is the list of Latin loan-words in Germanic. This glossary, the joint work of Kluge, Goetz and Meyer, is a new and valuable contribution, containing about 350 such loan-words with their Latin originals. Space permits here but a hasty reference to Kluge's valuable remarks on the accent of such loan-words in Germanic speech. In §25 the author summarizes the characteristic features of Germanic phonology in the Roman epoch. This summary, based upon the names preserved by Roman writers, shows that the first mutation and Verner's law were both practically completed, that the Germanic vocalism and accent were then in vogue. Under Greek, Slavo-Lettish, German influence upon Finnish-Lappish, and what the author terms 'Dunkle Beziehungen,' much valuable material is to be found, but that portion of the article which to Germanists is most welcome is the author's treatment of Germanic phonology, §§10 ff. Here are discussed in quick succession mutation, Verner's law, accent, ablaut, laws of finals, and the consequent speech-divisions, Primitive Germanic, General Germanic, East and West Germanic. The general conclusion of this examination (§26) is that the Germanic consonantism had undergone its most characteristic changes, especially mutation, in prehistoric time, but that the vocalism, on the contrary, shows many traces of continuous development. In §27 ff., 'Auslautgesetze,' we have a masterly presentation of a difficult subject in abstruse philology. Into the space of four pages is condensed the whole corpus of the laws of finals in Germanic. After having sketched in a brief paragraph the steps taken by Westphal, Scherer, Bugge, Wimmer, Thomsen, Leskien, Braune, Paul and Sievers in the discovery of these laws, the author proceeds to state the laws in particular, first for the primitive Germanic period, in which the oldest runes still preserve the final consonant (*s*) as R (hlevagastiR), thus showing that the law of dropping final *s* had not yet gone into effect. Then, following up this process of change of finals, Kluge unveils the very life

of Germanic speech at each successive stage of its development: Germanic, East and West Germanic, all joints (to use the old figure) of this great stem. This chapter is one of the triumphs of Germanic philology. The following sections on Konjugation, Deklination, Nominale Wortbildung we can only mention here to say that they fully satisfy the expectations of the readers of Kluge's 'Stammbildungslehre.'

Noreen had already prepared the way for the next article on 'Nordische Sprachen' by the publication of his 'Altisländische und Altnorwegische Grammatik' (1884), and, as far as method is concerned, by his 'Utkast till Föreläsningar e. u. g. Judlära' (1888). What Kluge's 'Vorgeschichte' is for Germanic, Noreen's article is for Northern speech. In the first division of the subject, 'Die urnordische Sprache,' the author discusses, among other things, the speech changes of the Viking period, the most important of which are given S. 422 ff. A particularly attractive feature of the discussion is the question of loan-words: (1) those which the Lapps borrowed from Norway and Sweden and the Finns from Finland and Esthland during the first centuries of our era; (2) those found in Old Irish MSS, whose original speech belonged to the time when Celts and Scandinavians came into contact (circa 800); (3) Russian loan-words since 862; (4) English loan-words of the time of the Danish rule in England. The chapter of English loan-words particularly is one that would well repay further research. Noreen's treatment of dialect differences is clear and thoroughly scientific. The author's treatment of Old Danish as "seiner ganzen Anlage nach die unursprünglichste der altnordischen Sprachen" presents Danish from a suggestive point of view. Part II on Phonology and Part III on Inflection set forth in clear outlines the rich form-development of the northern languages.

The articles of Kluge ('Vorgeschichte'), Noreen, Kögel and de Winkel would amply justify the publishers in issuing the articles of the Grundriss in separate form, as suggested by Tobler (*Literaturblatt*, XII, Nr. 2, 44).

Behaghel, in the chapter on the 'History of the German Language,' has attempted, evidently, to cover by the comparative method O. H. G., M. H. G. and N. H. G. speech, and as far as could be in such limited space has fairly succeeded. As intimated in the beginning of this review, the importance of German in the scheme of the Grundriss quite justified a separate chapter for O. H. G. and M. H. G. The author has traced with great care the boundaries of German speech, and shown how the language has advanced or retreated from time to time. He is quite justified in laying particular stress upon the 'Urkunden' in his article. Very satisfactory are the sections on 'Sprache und Schrift,' 'Das Tempo der Rede,' 'Accent.' In the treatment of the Phonology (S. 558 ff.) the author presents a comparative view of the development of N. H. G. speech. The treatment of Lautverschiebung may serve as a specimen of this part. Here the author succeeds in keeping in view both the older forms of the language and the modern dialectal differences. The important chapter of loan-words in N. H. German might properly have found a place in the discussion.

In Jan de Winkel's 'Geschichte der niederländischen Sprache,' as in the case of Kluge's 'Vorgeschichte,' we have in most respects a pioneer attempt, the work of Ypey on Netherlandish Speech having been finished in 1832, before

German philology had won general recognition as a science. Te Winkel's work is the more welcome to us across the sea, because it presents in well-ordered and more accessible form the rich materials accumulated by the researches of the last half-century. Here we have a clear view of the growth of Netherlandish speech from the second half of the twelfth century on. The author has proceeded cautiously, not going beyond his monuments to construct the Old Netherlandish language. A short paragraph setting forth te Winkel's views regarding the speech of this earlier period would have been of great interest as shedding new light on the development of Frankish speech. The treatment of dialect elements in Netherlandish (as Frisian, Saxon, Frankish Frisian-Saxon, Frisian-Frankish) under 'Dialektische Eigentümlichkeiten der Schriftsprache' and 'Lautsystem d. nl. Sprache,' and above all the 'Einwirkung fremder Sprachen auf das Niederländische,' give te Winkel's work a lasting value.

Another new article is to be found in Siebs' 'Geschichte der friesischen Sprache,' which is based upon the studies published in the author's larger work, 'Zur Geschichte der englisch-friesischen Sprache' (1889). Siebs defines the boundaries of Frisian dialects and indicates briefly the literary sources of the speech. Then recognizing the difficulty of treating *all* the dialects, he hits upon the happy method of selecting that one whose monuments "represent an older condition and are better preserved than most of the others." The most important dialectal variations are treated in a special chapter (S. 735). The map accompanying the whole shows the geographical relation of Frisian to German speech. The same wealth of detail and careful handling are to be found here, which characterize the author's larger work. It is to be hoped that the author of these valuable studies may ultimately succeed in solving the thus far evasive problem, the origins of Old English speech.

Kluge's hand appears again in the 'Geschichte der englischen Sprache.' Valuable contributions by Behrens and Einkenkel are affixed, the former on 'Französische Lehnbeziehungen,' the latter on 'Syntax.' Here, too, as in his 'Vorgeschichte,' Kluge touches briefly the question of foreign influence, particularly Celtic, Latin, Norse, Continental German. Under Norse influence the author has contributed much useful material. His *phonological criteria* deserve especial mention. Equally happy is the author's method of locating the origin of English literary speech (§7). The chapters on 'Puristische Strömungen' we should like to have seen continued to the present century. The question of French influence on English inflection, if not already extinct, has a final answer in Kluge's paragraph on 'Die Flexion des Substantivs' (S. 898 f.), where the flectional *s* of both gen. sg. and of the pl. is traced back to the O. E. flectional *s* (a remarkable exception to the laws of finals), which by analogy gradually absorbs the consonantal declension. French vocabulary in English is treated in Anhang I. The chapter on syntax, by Einkenkel, though mainly "streifzüge," will doubtless give stimulus to further research in this promising field.

The chapters on 'Sprachgeschichte' are followed by those on 'Dialects,' the first of which is an introductory article by Wegener, who sets forth with great acumen the conditions, stages, and products of dialect growth, as also the aims and value of dialect study. The author speaks from practical

experience, and offers many valuable hints as to the proper method of handling dialect materials. What he says of the importance of *State aid* in prosecuting this work is particularly in place. Many who have attempted this work on their own responsibility can testify as to the difficulties of such investigation without State support.

In the chapter on 'Scandinavian Dialects' Lundell has given a well-ordered treatment of the results of recent research in this domain. Leaving the traditional grouping—Swedish, Norwegian, Danish—the author adopts the more commendable morphological order—Färöisch, Isländisch, Westnordisch, Norrlandisch, Gottländisch, (Mittel)schwedisch, Südschwedisch. Lundell's brief sketch of the history of dialect study in the North, from the pioneer Bureus (the preceptor of Gustavus Adolphus) to the present, noting as it does the rise and solution of successive problems in northern dialect study, is a model of succinct chronological treatment.

The chapter on German Dialects, by Kauffmann, might easily have been extended into a volume. The author has performed his task as well as the space would allow. After a few general remarks on dialect study in Germany, and notice of the most important sources in this field, he proceeds to give lists of works on the various dialects of the Upper, Middle and Low German territories. It is due to the author, who has made so valuable a contribution to the study of German speech in his recent work '*Geschichte der schwäbischen Mundart im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit* (1890),' to say, that the defects of the present article seem rather to result from the original plan of the *Grundriss* than from faulty treatment. The original plan might have included: (1) a general sketch at least of the relation of German dialects to one another and to the literary speech (for which ample materials were at hand); (2) more particular reference to the linguistic problems, which this dialect study has solved, and questions of geographical distribution, such as Winkler attempted in his *Sprach-atlas*; (3) reference to German dialect domains in other countries, particularly America, which linguistically is a 'Kolonisationsgebiet' more extensive perhaps than all Germany and outlying speech-islands taken together. To be sure, comparatively little has been done in this field; but one of these dialects possesses a literature which can be favorably compared with many of those of the old Stammländer.

What is said here of the treatment of German dialects is perhaps even more applicable to the treatment of English Dialects by J. W. Wright, who has given ample proof of his scholarship in his *O. H. G. Reader*. To be sure, Kluge has taken up one paragraph of this subject in his discussion of the origin of the N. English literary speech. Wright has offered useful remarks on the contents and value of many of the works mentioned, and presents a clear classification of English dialects, pp. 979 ff.

No chapter of the *Grundriss* required more careful discrimination than that treating of Mythology. Not unfrequently the native mists which have enveloped German mythology have become denser by the foggy accretions of researches in this domain. Prominent among these fog-brewers was Simrock, who, not possessing in a high degree the clear insight of his illustrious master, J. Grimm, was too frequently unable to penetrate the great masses of his knowledge. But whatever may have been the shortcomings of the older

mythologists, their labors have given unfailing stimulus, which bids fair, with a sounder method in philology and history, to raise up a new generation of investigators whose trained eye can pierce the primeval gloom. Signs of better method (for mythology needs *method* more than anything else) are to be found in Beer (*Germania*, 33) and in the article in the *Grundriss* by Mogk. Mogk maintains that the presentation of the mythology of the German people can be successful only when the "critical sifting of the material," "the grouping of sources under more general points of view," in an "analytical way," have preceded. The author classifies his materials as *mittelbar* and *unmittelbar* (cf. S. 984). Mogk justly censures the tendency of the Grimm school to regard fairy tales, sagas, customs and usages as "degenerated forms of belief and the last traces of heathenism." Continuing the history of mythological study, the author characterizes briefly the work of W. Müller, A. Kuhn, W. Schwartz, comparing the "meteoric" theory of Kuhn and his school with the "solar" theory of Max Müller, and shows how Mannhardt introduced a new element into the comparison by proving that the same myth may develop in the same period from the same germ among very different peoples (S. 991); and how E. H. Meyer united the methods of Mannhardt and Kuhn. Then the views of Laistner, Lippert, Lachmann, Müllenhoff, Uhland, Bugge and Rydberg are reviewed. Mogk next discusses the relation of Northern to German mythology, regarding the Icelandic mythology as a distinct development, to some extent the creation of the Skalds. The method of separation is good, but further research will doubtless show that the kernel of Icelandic mythology was imported from Scandinavia.

This chapter, and with it the first volume of the *Grundriss*, closes with a discussion of the 'Seelenglaube,' 'Tottenkult,' etc. To those who believe in a mythological *science*, it is gratifying to see that the editor of the *Grundriss* has cautiously kept *Mythologie* and *Heldensage* separate and distinct (cf. also Symons, *Heldensage*, S. 2), instead of placing them together as one heading, as is sometimes done.

Heroic saga, like mythology, requires the most scrutinizing treatment. Symons, in the chapter on 'Heldensage,' like Mogk, approaches the subject from the historical point of view. The author's definition of Helden age gives the essence of his method: "der Gesamtschatz der Überlieferungen, welche sich im Heldenzeitalter eines Volkes oder Stammes gebildet oder dem Charakter dieses Zeitalters gemäss umgebildet haben und den Stoff zur cyklischen epischen Dichtung, sei es des betreffenden Stammes selber, sei es der Nachbarstämme oder verwandter Stämme, abgeben." Under 'Grundlage' and 'älteste Verbreitung' a critical review of the sources is given. The author's aim in the second part of the article is "eine Darstellung des gegenwärtigen Standes der Forschung in Bezug auf die einzelnen Sagenkreise." Though he withholds polemics from his treatment, he has not avoided giving occasion for controversy on certain points. In calling the 'Folkwandering' the "Geburtsstunde der germanischen Heldensage," for example, he would find opponents, not only in the adherents of the Vigfusson theory of Arminius-Siegfried, but in all who believe in a (now almost forgotten) Primitive Germanic Heldensage. To be sure the Folkwandering was the greatest convulsion for the Germanic races; but it is scarcely possible to imagine that

there was no heroic saga before the fourth century. If this statement be accepted, then the term 'Völkerwanderung' must be allowed to begin long before the days of Ermanric. So too the limitations set by the author (S. 2) are scarcely in harmony with the definition quoted above—the exclusion of the saga of Charles the Great, for example, who was King of *all* the Franks (East and West). But more of this in another place.

The chapters on 'Literature' contain much valuable material both new and old, but we can only note them briefly here. Sievers treats Gothic Literature; Mogk, Norwegian-Icelandic; Schück, Swedish-Danish; Kögel, Old High and Low German; Vogt, M. H. German. This is as far as we have received the 'Lieferungen' on literature. A detailed review of these would be more in place when all the articles are at hand.

Kögel's article deserves particular mention, inasmuch as the author has entered into the critical discussion of both literature and language, thus supplying from his own researches much that was wanting in Behaghel's treatment of the Old High German period of the language.

The chapters on 'Wirtschaft' (Inanama-Sternegg), 'Recht' (K. v. Amira), 'Kriegswesen' (A. Schultz), 'Sitte' (Kalund and Schultz), are quite in keeping with the articles noted above more in detail.

In closing, a remark in regard to the mode of giving bibliography. For a long time we have observed the apparent lack of order in the lists of works with which German writers, so precise and methodical in most other respects, begin their chapters. This disorder is particularly noticeable in the Grundriss, in the case of the lists given at the very beginning of a subject. A list of works may have the order of the alphabet, of the relative importance of the works named, or of publication, which last in historical discussions is usually the best. But *order* there should be.

M. D. LEARNED.

KARL BRUGMANN, Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Erster Band: Einleitung und Lautlehre. Zweiter Band (Wortbildungslehre), Erste Hälfte: Vorbemerkungen, Nominalcomposita, Reduplicierte Nominalbildungen, Nomina mit Stammbildenden Suffixen, Wurzelnomina; Zweite Hälfte, Erste Lieferung: Zahlwortbildung, Casusbildung, Pronomina.

Professor Brugmann's great work has advanced so near completion that there seems no longer any good ground left for withholding a notice of it from the readers of the Journal. The reviewer confesses to a habit—regrettable, doubtless, in some respects, of value, perhaps, in others—of waiting for second impressions before recording his opinion of an important work. In this instance the author may calmly call upon the critic to bide his own time; no living scholar is better fitted to sum up the results of the last twenty years' studies in the early history of the Indo-European languages than Professor Brugmann. He himself has borne a large share of the burden of these investigations; his clear, energetic voice has been heard to advantage on most of the leading questions which have engaged the attention of I. E. philologists.

Brugmann's work is the third attempt to present in a compendious form the combined history of the languages of our family. Bopp's great Compara-

tive Grammar and Schleicher's Compendium each passed through three editions; in each case the third edition was completed in 1871. We may fitly speak of the period between 1816, the date of Bopp's "Conjugation-system of the Sanskrit Language as compared with the Greek, Latin, Persian and German," and 1871 as the first period in the history of comparative grammar and linguistic science. And, however much the investigations of the last twenty years or so may exhibit their connection with and dependence upon what has preceded, there can be no doubt that the studies in comparative grammar and linguistic science from 1871 up to date deserve the distinction of being called the second period.

The first period of the science is characterized by the well-nigh unrivalled domination of the theory of agglutination. There are even now scholars who are willing to believe that I. E. *esti* 'he is' is compounded of a root *es* which had some general meaning of action 'to breathe' or 'to sit,' secondarily 'to exist,' 'to be,' and *ti*, a form of the pronominal stem of the third person (demonstrative) 'this one,' 'he.' This process of analysis and the interpretation of the analyzed element was carried out by Bopp, Schleicher, Curtius, and many others with rigid consistency. Bopp found no less than six independent radical elements, verbal and pronominal, in such a form as *δοθησόμεθα*, which was analyzed *δο-θε-σ-(y)ο-με-θα*. Schleicher, in his Compendium², p. 678, does not hesitate to explain the personal suffix of the first plural middle, e. g. Greek *-μεθα*, or Zend *-maidē*, *-maidāē-ca* as a compound of four pronominal stems, *ma + dhi + ma + si*.

This important linguistic theory has never passed unimpugned. Pott, the second founder of comparative philology, as he has been called, Ludwig Fick, Schmidt, and others have attacked it positively, or, at least, have avowed their inability to believe in it. Belief or non-belief in the actuality of agglutination does not make up the distinction between the past and the present. The difference is that the theory has for the present ceased to be a practical working theory, when applied to the oldest period of I. E. speech accessible to us. The scholars of the first period aimed to resolve nearly every word into component parts, undertaking to ascribe to each its original meaning; in order to accomplish this end they resorted to that curious mixture of naive faith and apodictic arbitrariness which characterizes the countless resolutions of words into component parts, and the confident endowment of the parts with definite original meanings.

I may say here with no uncertain voice that I do not count myself among those extremists who deny the existence of agglutinative processes in the older periods of I. E. speech because, forsooth, they find themselves without the means of tracing these processes. The later history of our languages affords the most abundant illustration of the entire line of development from word-composition to complete fusion into the single word, and there is positively no reason for denying them in older periods of language. If we find that the English adverbial 'suffix' *-ly* or the German abstract 'suffix' *-heit* are palpably faded and generalized words which originally existed by themselves, shall we say that this may be true of modern English and modern German, but cannot be true of Anglo-Saxon and Old-High-German and Gothic? Or shall we say that it is true also in Anglo-Saxon, etc., but is not to be thought

of in so early a linguistic period as Proto-Germanic? And if it be admitted for the German dialects in general, as no doubt it must be with equal cogency for Romance (cf. the suffix French *-ment*, Italian *-mente* in modern times, or the suffix *-iter* in *breviter*, etc., in older times), by what right can it be denied to the period of I. E. history preceding the separate development of the Germanic and Italic languages?

The scepticism which causes this denial is short-sighted. It confuses the principle with the degree of difficulty in its application. The so-called I. E. language is a reconstruction of the hither side of a linguistic period, doubtless of great length; every reconstructed Indo-European word is a more or less doubtful *terminus ad quem*—doubtful precisely because it is a mere reconstruction—and we are generally without any information whatsoever regarding its entire history all along the line up to the *terminus a quo*. We are therefore in doubt when, where, and how to apply the principle of agglutination. Does this argue that agglutination never took place? The earlier worthies of comparative philology were carried away by their extraordinary fondness for this principle, due to the fact that all linguistic inquiry seems to derive from it its final answer, and the strain under which the inquiry is carried on is relaxed satisfactorily in certain fundamental results, precisely as satisfactory to the mind of the linguist as the protoplasm is to the mind of the biologist. Even if they should have erred in every one of their explanations down to the identification of *-mi* in I. E. *es-mi* 'I am' with the stem of the pronoun of the first person, they were unquestionably correct in their belief that somewhere and somehow agglutination contributed actively to the earliest formative processes of I. E. speech.

Hand in hand with the total denial of agglutination go equally unreasonable attacks on the idea of root. Especially Pāṇini, the famous Hindu grammarian, is the fashionable scapegoat of those who believe that they have seen a totally new and superior variety of light. 'Pāṇini's empty clatter of roots' is the expression which one hears bandied about. Yet Pāṇini was a truly great grammarian; he treated his period of Indo-European speech in a most excellent fashion; indeed, willy-nilly, any and every I. E. language is and has to be presented essentially as Pāṇini presented his. Pāṇini found the roots of the speech of his time; of course they were not always ultimate roots, any more than the good modern English roots *count* and *preach* (*computare* and *praedicare*) are ultimate roots. Other times other roots. Now, we might, if necessary, go so far as to say that no Sanskrit root is ultimate, that no reconstructed I. E. root is ultimate; for may they not one and all be secondary products just as the English examples quoted above, or like Sk. *gṛh* 'to protect,' which is abstracted secondarily from *gopayāmi*, a denominal verb from the compound *go-pā* 'shepherd, cowherd'?

But no temporizing can exclude the conviction that ultimately, at some remote prehistorical period there must have been beginnings, constructed with more or less clear consciousness: now, these are the roots. And it does not matter a particle whether these were monosyllabic or dissyllabic (stems, bases), or possibly in some cases polysyllabic, whether or not they even then exhibited certain arrangements of consonants and vowels as in historical times, whether they were verbal, infinitival, or nominal; there must have been in some form original, first utterances.

Another notion which is paraded with not a little pomp at present is this, that speech began with sentences. This is both true and not true according as we define the word sentence. If the word sentence conveys the meaning of an aggregation of coordinated and subordinated words it is most certainly untrue, as syntactical coordination and subordination comes necessarily after the production of the words to be coordinated or subordinated. If, on the other hand, it is argued that the primitive word-creation (root) must in itself and by itself have covered the entire ground of one single utterance or communication, the argument becomes a truism. No one has ever, or could ever have held any different view. At best one may claim with a fair degree of plausibility that the root was at the very time of its first emanation aided by gesture which helped to fill out its meaning, to support its efficiency, and to narrow down its vagueness.

The improper application of the theory of agglutination to early speech-materials was checked chiefly by three causes: the more rigid application of phonetic law, the increased insight into the scope and operations of analogy, and the recognition of adaptation as a formative principle of the highest importance.

The conscientious regard for phonetic law acts as a constant power of veto against the facile assumption of agglutinative processes. Thus Schleicher's explanation of the personal suffix *-μεθα*, Zend *-maidē*, a contraction of **madhi-masi*, is unwarrantable because it assumes the loss of the penultimate *s* between two vowels, and we know of no such phonetic law in I. E. times, as familiar as this very law is in Greek. The final *-masi* can appear in Zend as *-mahi* and nothing else.

Analogy is in its way fully as hostile to the practical application of the theory of agglutination as phonetic law. A crust of analogical formations is deposited over all language, early as well as late; the reconstructed I. E. speech was, doubtless, no more exempt from it than more modern periods. The resolution of inflected words into compounds, each part of which is endowed with an independent value, cannot be undertaken before the analogical crust is pared off. To omit this necessarily involves a process of analysis, different from the synthesis which has preceded, or the analysis of forms which have never been joined together at all. He who should analyze the Lat. masc. fem. comparative *posterior* into stem *poster-* and comparative suffix *-ior* would obtain a suffix *-iōr*, which is to all intents and purposes as good a suffix as any. But from the point of view of agglutinative analysis his result is quite worthless, since the *r* of *-iōr* is secondary, due to rhotacism extended from the oblique cases, *posteriorem*, etc.: the nominatives in *-ior* have been adapted secondarily to distinctive use as masculines and feminines. Greek *καθίζω*, future *καθιῶ*, has assimilated completely to that class of derived verbs of which *βαθίζω* is a representative. He who divides *καθίζω* into root *καθ-* and suffix *-ίζω*, forgetting, as the Greeks came near doing, that it is a compound of the verb *ίζω* and the preposition *κατά*, again enters upon a false path. Now we are in danger of retracing in just as false a manner every word coming from a period in which we have no control over the history of analogical attraction. We do not know how long a life the I. E. parent-speech had lived prior to its subdivision into the linguistic groups of historical times; it may have been, probably was, a

thousand years or more, and half a millennium is quite sufficient to pervade a language completely with analogical formations, as we may learn from the history of English or German during such a period.

A force of the first rank, but scantily recognized, and truly difficult to recognize in early speech is adaptation. I have read Professor Brugmann's work as far as published from cover to cover, and do not remember to have seen this significant and useful word employed in the body of the text. The thing, however, if not the word, is there. The use of Lat. *-mini*, originally the suffix of the nominative plural of the present middle participle (*feri-mini* = *φερόμενοι*), as the personal inflection of the second plural passive, is a case in point.¹ Adaptation is operative in living speech to-day. The recent coinage of the word *electrocution* is the result of the adaptation of the last two syllables of the word *execution* to the meaning 'punishment by deaths of all sorts, after due legal process.' To-morrow, if drowning were decreed by law, it would be **hydrocution*. The word *terrorite* has recently loomed up in the papers as a designation of an extremely destructive explosive; it is coined after *dynamite*, and represents the tentative adaptation of the final element *-ite* to designations of explosives.

All this amounts to the following: A formal element originally either devoid of any special functional value, or possessed of a value which has faded out, may be infused with some definite grammatical or lexical value which has been read into it by the speaker. This principle must have operated with especial vigor in early linguistic periods when the logical categories were scarce or were just beginning to develop. Thus it is perfectly possible that the element of personal inflection even in such a word as *esmi* 'I am' was acquired, not by the fusion of the root *es* with a distinct pronominal element *mi*, but by this process of secondary infusion: *esmi* may have had originally no definite personal value; it may have meant 'being,' either in the sense of a noun of action or noun of agency, which by specialization was restricted to use in certain verbs of the first person. Later the element *mi* might easily enough have been felt to be the special carrier of the personal function, just as the innocent syllables *-cution* were to the sense of him who formed the word *electrocution* fraught with the destruction contained primarily in the word *execution* in its entirety. And we must not neglect to consider the additional possibility that the process of adaptation of the final element *-mi* in *esmi* to the function of a personal suffix of the first person might have been aided by the contemporaneous existence in the language of an independent pronoun of the first person containing an *m* (cf. Gr. *με*, Lat. *me*, Goth. *mi-k*, Sk. *me*). All these possibilities—they have no right to figure as anything more—are supported, moreover, by the salient fact that there are other forms which serve as first persons singular, like *φέρω*, *ferō* (I. E. *bherō*), where agglutinative analysis is still more problematic.

Thus it may be seen that the early glottogonic processes which were supposed, in the first period of the science, to be almost entirely in charge of agglutination, were in reality brought about by three important processes: (1) agglutination; (2) adaptation; (3) analogy. And we cannot emphasize too

¹ Cf. the reviewer's recent essay: On Adaptation of Suffixes in Congeneric Classes of Substantives, A. J. P. XII 1-29.

strongly the difficulty of recognizing the operations of any of these forces as soon as we touch the prehistoric speech. Hitherto nearly all, if not all, glottogonic analysis has turned out, in the light of subsequent criticism, little more than a statement of more or less remote possibilities. The optimism of scholars will no doubt lead them to make inroads again and again into these unknown and probably unknowable regions, but what they bring with them will be very likely to be overthrown by some slight kaleidoscopic shift of the materials under investigation.

I have not introduced these remarks merely for the purpose of instruction. Professor Brugmann's views on these questions are in general sober and satisfactory; yet he has, I think, more than once advanced untenable or highly improbable glottogonic theories. These are likely—such is the force of his authority—to propagate entire lines of investigation which are pretty certain to turn out fruitless. And it seems to me that he may be accused of too much boldness in two directions: on the one hand he still applies agglutination with a degree of confidence which is out of proportion to the intrinsic probability of the analysis; on the other hand we occasionally find sweeping assumptions of adaptation in cases where the explanation offered may at best claim the right to be regarded as a faint possibility.

A considerable amount of agglutinative analysis is applied in the chapter on contraction of vowels during the common I. E. period, treated at Vol. I, pp. 106–110. Brugmann himself does not fail to recognize the hypothetical character of his reconstructions. We are asked to believe that I. E. *bherō* (φέρω, ferō) is the product of contraction of stem *bhero-* and suffix 'ax.' On the face of it it seems more likely that *bherō* is the nominative singular of an agent-stem in *n*; cf. Lat. *edō* 'eater,' Sk. *rājā* 'ruler.' The addition of specific personal suffixes which are added frequently to *bherō*, e. g. Aryan present indicative *bharā-mi* and present subjunctive *bharā-ni*, is not without interest in this connection. The assumption that the nominative plural *ekūōs* (Sk. *agvās*) is the product of contraction of *ekuo-* and *-es* imposes upon the language a word *ekuo*; this is more likely to be merely an abstraction from the group of forms that have assembled, doubtless after many vicissitudes, in the paradigm of the so-called *-o*-stems. Still less credible is the form *sto-i*, in *στα-ῖ-μεν*, which implies a straight belief in a word *sto*. In Vol. II, §186 (p. 521), the author expresses a certain degree of confidence in locative suffixes *-en* and *-er*. This opens out a long vista of improbabilities, and I have pointed out the error involved in this view in the essay cited above (A. J. P. XII, p. 21, note 2).

On the other hand we have what I cannot help regarding as an extremely improbable assumption of adaptation in the explanation of the origin of the grammatical feminine gender in the I. E. languages. Brugmann assumes that this vast category, of unequalled importance in the history of our languages from the earliest accessible times, is due to the adaptation of a pair of endings which once upon a time turned up accidentally at the end of a few designations of women; see Vol. II, §57, note (pp. 100–1), and §145 (pp. 429–30), and previously the author's article in the fourth volume of *Techmer's Internationale Zeitschrift für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 100 ff.

A few words like I. E. *māmā* and *ṃā* were designations of females in early

times. Their suffix *-ā-* had nothing to do with that feminine value. The feminine value contained in these words was read into the suffix and thence propagated, so that, e. g. the masculine *ekhuos* 'horse' was furnished with a feminine *ekhuā*, etc., after the pattern of these words. Similarly that other important feminine declension in *-iē-*, *-iā-* (reduced from *-i-*), by which are formed most of the feminines from consonantal stems (e. g. the present participle, masc. *φέρων*, fem. *φέρονσα* for **φέρωντ-ια*; Sk. *bhāran*, fem. *bharant-i*), was derived from some solitary designation of a female ending in the same way. In this case the author is very much at a loss to find such an intrinsically feminine word. He mentions Sk. *stri* 'woman,' but is it at all likely that this word is proethnic, and, if not, where is one to be found that is? What possible I. E. feminine word can the ancient couplet *ul'gos* 'wolf,' *ul'gi* 'she-wolf' (note the shift of the accent which is prehistoric: Sk. *vṛkas*=Goth. *vulf(a)s*; Sk. *vṛkī*=Old Norse *y/gr*) really be patterned after? Must we assume that the patriarchal prototype was entirely lost after having left descendants countless as the sand of the seas? Then, again, the consistent transfer from a few isolated words of two totally different endings, *-ā-* and *-iē-* (*-i-*), argues a certain amount of intention on the part of the speaker: it seems teleological, and what purpose could there have been in view?

There are also proethnic feminine nouns ending neither in *-ā-*, nor in *-iē-* (*-i-*), like Lat. *vāx*=Sk. *vāc* (I. E. *uōqs*) 'voice,' or Sk. *kām-*, Gr. *χάωv* 'earth'; here Brugmann is constrained to assume that they borrowed their gender from synonyms like Gr. *αἰθήρ* and Lat. *terra*. But here again there is the great difficulty of finding synonyms old enough to have served as a pattern; certainly the pedigree of *αἰθήρ* and *terra* is scarcely respectable enough to warrant the assumption that they were in existence in early proethnic times. In truth it seems to me one of the primary facts in the history of the development of gender in our languages that 'earth,' 'mother-earth' is personified as a female in contrast with heaven as a male. And we may suspect shrewdly that our author, if he were thoroughly familiar with modern colloquial English, would have been very much less disposed to attack the principle of personification of inanimate objects in general. What formal analogy in a language so depleted in its gender-distinctions as modern English urges a negro cook to personify the range (cooking-stove) as a female: 'she is not behaving at all well to-day, she has to be petted and coaxed before she *do* her work'?

Genuine formative elements, expressive of feminine gender, are found in many families of languages, and the distinction is generally equally pervasive. In the Shemitic languages the affirmative element *ta* (*-t*), the special characteristic of the feminine, holds about the same ground as the I. E. suffixes *-ā* and *iē* (*-i*), and the assumption that it was propagated from one or two designations of females is as little plausible as in the case of the I. E. suffixes. Here also many categories of words without the special feminine suffix are personified as females, e. g. common and proper nouns of cities and countries, names of parts of the body, etc. Here also the matter of gender unquestionably lies deeper than a mere formal extension of an accidental element at the end of one or two words.

One need hardly say that there are many other points of view in so large a work about which there may be honest difference of opinion. I shall only

pick out one or two by the way of illustration. I regret for my part that Brugmann has not given the theory of dissyllabic roots more kindly consideration. It seems to me that Osthoff's criticism of it in the fourth volume of the *Morphologische Untersuchungen* has not shaken its foundation very seriously. The fact remains that orthotone strong root-forms in *-éna-*, *-éna-*, *-éma-*, *-éra-* and *-éla-* correspond to weak, low-tone root-forms with long labial, nasal and lingual vowels: *-ā-*, *-ṅ-*, *-m-*, *-ṛ-* and *-ḷ-*. Moreover, the representation of the lingual and nasal vowels differs regularly and characteristically in the Aryan (Indo-Iranian) and non-Aryan (European) languages. Thus, strong *-éna-* in *ḡéna-tōr* (Sk. *jāni-tar-*, Gr. *γενέτωρ*, Lat. *geni-tōr*) is reduced in the weak forms to I. E. *ḡṅ-* in *ḡṅ-tō-s*; the *ṅ* appears as *ā* in the Aryan languages (Sk. *jā-tā-*, Zend *zā-ta-*), but as *nā* in the European languages: Lat. *nā-tu-s*, Gr. (*κασι*-) *γνή-ro-s*, Goth. *knō-d(a)-s*. Similarly strong *-éra-* appears as weak *-ir-* or *-ūr-* in Sanskrit, but as *-rā-* in the European languages: Sk. *stīri-man-*: *stīr-nd-* = Gr. *τέρε-τρο-ν*: *τρον-τό-s*; Lat. *grā-tu-s* = Sk. *gūr-ta-*. In Sanskrit especially the parallelism between dissyllabic root-types with monosyllabic root-types in cases like *pāvi-tu-m*, *pā-tā-s*: *grō-tu-m*, *gru-tā-s*; *jāni-tum*, *jā-tā-s*: *tān-tu-m*, *ta-tā-s*; *dāmi-tu-m*, *dān-tā-s*: *gān-tu-m*, *ga-tā-s*; *jāri-tār-*, *gūr-tā-s*: *dhār-tu-m*, *dhṛ-tā-s* has sustained itself very completely and cannot be due to accident. Brugmann's hyphen in cases like *ḡen-a-tōr* involves at any rate a chronological inconsistency, since *ḡen-a-* was a unit at the time when *ḡṅ-* (*ḡṅ-tō-s*) arose from it by reduction, precisely in the same sense as *men-* in *men-tōr* at the time when its weak form turned out as *mṇ-* (*mṇ-tō-s*). One might with equal justice to chronological considerations divide *me-n-tōr*, or the like, as *ḡen-a-tōr*.

Brugmann's treatment of the recessive accent in Greek, patterned as it was after Wheeler's, I have criticized systematically in an essay entitled 'The Origin of the Recessive Accent in Greek,' A. J. P. IX, pp. 1-41. A partial reply to my criticism is to be found in the second edition of his *Griechische Grammatik* (Ivan Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, Vol. II), pp. 86-7. I am glad that he makes some concessions, and cannot refrain from expressing the hope that others will follow. Brugmann accepts my explanation that the scantily reported Doric accent evidences a systematic 'progressive' accent; it is progressive in this sense, that the accent appears shifted forward to the end of the word just one mora when compared with the Aeolic. This establishes beyond doubt the principle of accentual change on the basis of purely phonetic analogy, since it is, as I have stated, impossible to believe that the analogical influences of single words should all of them—by conspiracy as it were—have combined to change the accent in the direction towards the end of the word, and never towards the beginning. Precisely the same conditions confront us on scanning the Aeolic accentuation. Here also the assumption of individual analysis which transformed the accent of all Pan-Hellenic words, so as to result in a perfect system of recession, could only have been worked by a miracle, or a formal ratification meeting on the part of the speakers, unless we assume the propagation of the recessive accent from the verb to all the words of the language by phonetic analogy. Now it is well-nigh incredible that this spread of the verbal accent over the entire language in one quarter, the Aeolic, should not have been preceded by a partial transference in the other dialects, and this is just what has happened in Pan-Hellenic times in the case of all trochaic dissyllables accented on the

first syllable. These are never paroxytone ($\acute{\ } \cup$), but properispomena ($\acute{\ } \cup$). I cannot conceive why Brugmann says in note 1 on page 86 that $\nu\eta\epsilon\varsigma$ cannot be regarded as having the recessive accent, because $\nu\eta\delta\varsigma$ and $\nu\eta\omega\nu$ are not recessive. From the beginning $\nu\eta\epsilon\varsigma$ had the acute accent on the penult (Pan-Hellenic $*\nu\acute{\alpha}f\text{-}\epsilon\varsigma$ = Sk. $n\acute{a}v\text{-}as$), and the change of the acute to the circumflex is the precise circumstance which characterizes the accent as recessive. The conservatism of $\nu\eta\delta\varsigma$ and $\nu\eta\omega\nu$ in retaining their respective etymological accents, notwithstanding the fact that there are recessively accented forms in the same paradigm, is of a piece with the generally more pertinacious resistance which oxytones and words having the I. E. slurred tone—see my essay, p. 17, note—on the ultimate ($\nu\eta\omega\nu$) exhibit throughout; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 31–2. The fact that all barytone dissyllables in the language are properispomena ($\acute{\ } \cup$) is due to the ascendancy of a certain accentual type which overrides all etymological considerations; the difference between Aeolic and Attic-Ionic is that in the former all the recessive types emanating from the finite verb have overridden the etymological accents, while in the latter only the type $\acute{\ } \cup$ has conquered the entire territory. The remaining verbal accentual types in Attic-Ionic have, however, also in various degrees infringed upon the non-verbal forms, as I have shown in the article cited above.

I need scarcely say in conclusion that Brugmann's work ought to belong to the familiar apparatus of every Indo-European philologist. It offers a well-considered, soberly written grammar of the sounds and inflections of every I. E. language, resting on the broad basis of an incisive knowledge of all of them. Excellent bibliographical statements accompany all the chapters, tending to stimulate further research on any given point. The entire work is pervaded by a fine historical spirit; it cannot fail to attract an increasing number of scholars to a keener interest in that subtle, intense, constantly active life which pervades the formal side of our languages, rendering them in a supreme degree capable of being efficient vehicles for the correspondingly subtle, intense and constantly active Indo-European thought.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

Wörterbuch zu Xenophons Anabasis; für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von FERDINAND VOLLBRECHT. Siebente verbesserte Auflage besorgt unter Mitwirkung von Dr. WILHELM VOLLBRECHT. Mit 78 in den Text eingedruckten Holzschnitten, drei lithographierten Tafeln und mit einer Übersichtskarte. Leipzig, Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1891.

The seventh and latest edition of the standard vocabulary to Xenophon's *Anabasis*, by Ferdinand Vollbrecht, of Hanover, Germany, revised by his son, Dr. Wilhelm Vollbrecht, Oberlehrer zu Ratzeburg, has just appeared.

The system of studying the classics by the aid of special vocabularies, which is rapidly gaining ground in our American schools, is essentially German, and amongst the best of these special dictionaries is this of Dr. Vollbrecht, elaborated from the original one by his father.

To one who has examined the vocabularies of the *Anabasis* now in use in America, it is plain that the dictionary in question lies at the basis of them all, both from the character of their definitions and, especially, from their references to the text. The exact improvements of this seventh edition,

dated Hanover and Ratzeburg, February, 1891, consist partly of a number of alterations and improvements in accordance with the observations of Nitsche in the *Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie*, 1887, No. 36. Other changes were adopted from various historical papers and from Schmidt's *Handbuch der Synonymik*. One noteworthy alteration, illustrative of the effect of modern archaeological research, is the withdrawal of one of the engravings, with its accompanying description, explanatory of *διαγκυλόμαι* (*Anab.* IV 3, 28). This engraving was originally derived from Bötticher's *Olympia*, but according to the more recent investigations of Wassmansdorff has been shown to have a doubtful bearing, if any, on the subject. It was based on the figure in the great altar-frieze of Pergamon, of the giant's hand apparently in the act of throwing a spear, but Wassmansdorff's researches have invalidated this idea, and leave us, as before, and with less perplexity, to the representations on ancient vases for the correct explanation of *διαγκυλόμαι*.

Altogether the work is as nearly perfect as, with our present knowledge, it could be, and no student of Greek literature nor teacher of Xenophon's works can well afford to be without it.

CHARLES TUDOR WILLIAMS.

Johann Elias Schlegel als Trauerspieldichter mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Gottsched. Von Dr. JOHANNES RENTSCH. Leipzig, Paul Beyer, 1890.

In the heat of the strife between the Leipziger and Züricher many significant signs of the times were lost from view. It is difficult even after a hundred and fifty years to review the Gottsched-Bodmer feud and not join in the general condemnation of the lifeless doctrines of the great Leipzig dictator. Fortunately, however, students of this period are beginning to turn their attention to those men who, though little renowned as partisans, nevertheless represented the unbiassed—let us say rather the normal—attitude in literary criticism. Such a man was Johann Elias Schlegel, the worthy predecessor of his illustrious nephews, August Wilhelm and Friedrich. To us Schlegel's greatest importance lies in his soundness of view in literary matters and his manly and unpartisan spirit in his relation both to Gottsched and Bodmer. Rentsch, in the work before us, following a suggestion of Danzel, presents for the first time a clear and satisfactory view of the successive stages of Schlegel's association with Gottsched. Beginning with the performance of 'Orest und Pylades,' which gained Schlegel access to Gottsched, Rentsch sets forth Schlegel's independent attitude and literary activity in Gottsched's 'Vormittägige Rednergesellschaft,' in the 'Critische Beyträge,' in the strife with the Swiss, and in the contributions to Gottsched's 'Schaubühne,' and traces Schlegel's gradual withdrawal from his intolerant master and final union with Bodmer through his contributions to the 'Bremer Beiträge,' and his association particularly with Hagedorn. In this as well as in the other two chapters on the Sources, Content, Structure, Speech and Metre of the tragedies, Rentsch has shown Schlegel to be in tragedy what Danzel and Antoniewicz have claimed for him in aesthetics, a forerunner of Lessing!

M. D. LEARNED.

REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, Vol. XLV.¹

Pp. 1-10, 203-211. A. v. Domaszewski. Notes on the history of the government of Roman provinces. I. Moesia and Hispania citerior. CIL. XI 1835 from which it appears that the office of governor of Moesia and that of commander of the two Moesian legions were vested in one person, a praetor, though militating against the usual order, is satisfactorily explained on the basis of other historical statements. We find in Hispania citerior also under the Emperor Tiberius, two legions commanded by one praetor legatus; and this was continued until the time of the Emperor Galba, for T. Vinus, Galba's adviser and supporter, was 'legatus eius in Hispania' and commander of the two legions in Spain. As such he made Galba Emperor of Rome. Whether the two legions remained under the command of one general during the Flavian period remains an open question. In a note on the legati iuridices of Hispania citerior, Dom. holds, against Strabo, that there were never more than two at one time.—II. Pannonia inferior. In this article Dom. undertakes to show that Pannonia inferior was constituted a praetorian province by Trajan and continued to be one to the time of Septimius Severus. An appendix treats of the *speculatores legionum*.

Pp. 11-20. A. Ludwich, emending the Homeric Hymn to Hermes, reads, l. 436-7, *βουφόνε, μηχανιώτα, πονεύμενε δαιτὸς ἑταίρη, | πεντήκοντα βοῶν ἀντάζια ταῦτα μεμνηλῶς.* || 460-2 . . . *κραιαῖνον (?) ἀκόντιον ἢ μὲν ἄγων σε | . . . οὐκ ἀπατήσω | . . . καὶ ἐς τέλος ἡγεμονεύσω.* || 478 foll. *εὐκηλὸς μετὰ χερσίν . . . | . . . ἐπισταμένην ἀγορεύειν | εὐμόλπει μὲν ἔπειτα φέρων . . . || 519 καὶ κεφαλῇ νέσειας . . . | and 565 ἀνδρα δαοίης.*

Pp. 21-49. C. Haebler's *Quaestiones criticae* in L. Annaei Senecae de beneficiis libros prove that the Codex Nazarianus, the basis of Haupt's edition, shows in some passages greater corruptions than the inferior codices. H. discusses and emends I 9, 5 *rapta spargere, sparsa rapaci avaritia recolligere* certant; I 2, 3 *si reddit* (redditur) aliquid, *lucrum est: si non reddit* (redditur) *damnum* non est; VII 4, 5; 10, 3; VI 21, 2; III 18, 1. I 1, 9 where he reads *deinde ne deos quidem immortales ab hac tam effusa nec unquam intermissa benignitate sacrilegi negligentesque eorum deterrent. utuntur natura sua et ipsos numerum suorum malos interpretes iuvant.* The article closes with a discussion of the lacuna in I 9 between §§2 and 3.

Pp. 50-57. Th. Kock, in an article on Phrynichus and Aristophanes, answers and corrects some statements made by G. Kaibel in a paper on the Old Attic Comedy (Hermes, XXIV 35; A. J. P. XI 380); he discusses the Ephialtes of Phrynichus (frg. 3), the *Δις ναυαγός*, read by Kaibel *Διόνυσος ναυαγός*; the

¹ See A. J. P. XI 384.

authorship of the *Nῆσοι* by Aristophanes, not by Archippus, as Kaibel believes, and the frg. 294, 3 of the *Εἰρήνη δευτέρα*.

Pp. 58-99, 212-222. E. Oder. Contributions to the history of agriculture among the Greeks. I. The Byzantine collection *αἱ περὶ γεωργίας ἐκλογαί*, incorrectly called *γεωπονικά*, contains above all the *συναγωγή γεωργικῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων* of Anatolius of Berytus, who can neither be identified with the praefectus praetorio Illyrici (346-360 A. D.) nor with the magister officiorum and friend of the Emperor Julian, as Gemoll contends. The authorities quoted by Anatolius are Democritus, Pamphilus, Apuleius, Diophanes and Africanus, Florentinus, Valens, Tarentinus and Leo (Leonti[n]us). On the basis of the quotations contained in the eclogues Oder examines date and value, tradition and condition of the works of these authors.—II. On the relation of Anatolius to the Byzantine collection, and especially to his contemporary Didymus the physician. The redactor of the *Geoponica* took the eclogues now from the work of Anatolius and now from that of Didymus, supplementing the one with the help of the other.

Pp. 100-110. H. Nissen. On Roman municipal laws. The *lex Iulia municipalis*, dating from the year 46 B. C., was in force in Rome from Jan. 1, 45 B. C., and in the provincial towns from Jan. 1, 44 B. C. Nissen examines again the tablets of Heraclea and the *lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae*, which was an enlarged municipal law-code.

Pp. 111-137. I. Ilberg. On the edition of Hippocrates' works by Artemidorus Capito and Dioscorides.

Pp. 138-145, 223-235. Ivo Bruns. Studies in Alexander of Aphrodisias (contin. fr. Vol. XLIV 613; A. J. P. XI 388). On Quaestiones II 3 and Alexander's views on 'Providence.'

Pp. 146-169. O. Ribbeck reads 'Θαριστός (Ps. Theokr. XXVII) l. 9 ἀδύ τι γηράσκω; τόδε κ. τ. λ., l. 10 ἂ (χά) σταφυλὶς σταφὶς ἐσται, ὃ νῦν ῥόδον, αὖτον ὀλεῖται. Then follows l. 18 of the Cod. Ambrosianus. After l. 15 there is a lacuna of two lines; l. 23 read καὶ τί φίλον στέρξαιμι; τίν' οὐ τρομέουσι γυναῖκες;—'Ἀλγεῖς (Theokr. XXI) 58 read πίστευσα καλὰ γρετον εὐπέρνατον.—J. Schmidt retains τάδε τερπνὰ πεπόνθει in Theokr. VII 78, and explains ll. 148-155.—C. Bartholomae. The Greek infinitive suffix -σθαι started from such a form as *Feideσθαι*. *Feideσθαι*=*Feides* (from *Feidos* as *ἐπεσ-βόλος* from *ἐπος*) + *θαι*, a dative form of *ἄθῃ* 'to place.' On the analogy of *εἶδε-ται*, *εἶδεσ-θαι* originated *φέρεται*, *φέρεσθαι*, and thus -σθαι became the suffix of the infinitive. Forms like *πεφάνθαι* are later analogical formations.—M. Manitius, pp. 153-7, 316-8. On Late Latin poets.—F. B. Old Latin (contin. from XLIII 479; A. J. P. X 370). Participles in -sus in Plautus and their derivatives are often to be replaced by the older forms in -tus. Stich. 745 read *terta* for *tersa*; Trin. 820 f. *saltpotentis*=the Lord of the saltum (=later *salsum*)=the bitter, while *multi-potens*=*γλυκύς* remained intact and furnished a pun on *multi-potens*=*πολυκρατής*. Forms like *ex insulso salsum* do not belong to the language of Plautus.

Pp. 161-171. F. Buecheler restores and comments on two more Oscan inscriptions, with additional remarks on those published in Vol. XLIV 321.

Pp. 172-177. A. Koerte. Augustan poets in Philodemus. Two fragments of the tracts *περὶ κολακείας* and *περὶ φιλαργυρίας*, published in the *Volumina Herculanensia*², I f. 92, col. 11 and VII f. 196, frg. 12 mention an *Οὐάριος* and a *Κωϊντίλιος*, whom Koerte supposes to be L. Varius Rufus and Quintilius Varus Cremonensis, the Epicurean philosophers and friends of Augustus, Vergil and Horace.

Pp. 178-202. F. Duemmler speaks of the sources of the *Nekyia* of Polygnotus, described by Pausanias, X 25-32, and the *Nekyia* of the Nosti.

Pp. 237-264, 385-418. G. Eskuche. An examination of the last two feet of the Latin hexameter from Ennius to Walafridus Strabo (180,000 verses) shows a steady diminution in elision in conformity with an increasing exactness of the metrical standard. Variation from the rule is due to distinct imitation of earlier poets.

Pp. 265-272. O. Crusius reconstructs, by a comparison of Clemens Alexandrinus *Protr.* 16, p. 17, Ddf. with Firmicus Maternus *de errore prof. relig.* 26, p. 119 and Arnobius *adv. nat.* V 20 β, 191 Rf., a fragment which he assigns to a lost comedy of Rhinthon, the Tarentine originator of the *ἱλαροτραγωδία*.

Pp. 273-283. E. Bruhn points out some excerpts in Suidas from Aelian's V. H. and from Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca*. On pp. 477-80 C. de Boor corrects some of Bruhn's statements.

Pp. 284-87. C. Hülsen disagrees with Buresch's hasty conclusions (*Vol. XLIV* 489; *A. J. P.* XI 387) that CIG. III 6184 and 6185 are forgeries.

Pp. 288-310. H. Swoboda prints remarks on the political position and influence of the Athenian strategē, showing that they possessed special political rights, the most important being that of laying proposals before the *βουλή*. The conclusions are based throughout on a careful study of the CIA.

Pp. 311-320. C. Häberlin. *Arist. Polit.* VI 18.—O. Ribbeck emends various passages of Plautus *Bacch.* 123, 379, 393 foll., 929; Terence *Eun.* 560; *Propert.* I 17, 2; Ovid and Statius.—F. Becher would have *tempus* omitted after *tertium* in *Cic. pro Lig.* II 4-5.—J. Schmidt maintains the general trustworthiness of Sallust's geographical statements in the *Jugurtha*; also see p. 640.—C. Weymann has an additional note to Ihm's remarks on *Maximus Taurinensis* (*Vol. XLIV* 523; *A. J. P.* XI 387).

Pp. 321-334. F. Buecheler. *Coniectanea* to *Moretum*, *Copa*, *Culex*; *CIL.* VIII 5530; the Carthaginian sepulchral inscriptions, *Pelagonius*, etc.

Pp. 335-360. M. Klatt defends, against Unger (*Philol.* 46, 766), Plutarch's statement, *Cleom.* 38, 1, that Cleomenes III was King of Sparta for 16 years, and shows that he became king several years before the beginning of the war called after his name.

Pp. 361-370. G. Gundermann prints and comments on a fragment of the *Codex Justinianus*, found in the library at Cologne.

Pp. 371-384. Joh. Toepffer answers the objections to his 'Attische Genealogie,' which E. Maas had published in the *Göttinger Gelehrten Anzeigen*, 1889, pp. 801-832.

Pp. 419-435. R. Hirzel believes that Plato's Alcibiades I is an answer, by a member of the Academy, to the attacks by Aristoxenus of Tarentum upon Socrates and his methods (Euseb. praep. ev. XI 3, 8).

Pp. 436-464. E. Klebs. The collection of the Script. hist. Aug. The theory of later insertions into the vita Severi (from Victor) and into the vita Marci (from Eutropius), advocated by Dessau and Mommsen, Hermes 24, 337 and 25, 228, as well as of the Vaticanian post eventum in the vita Probi is not well founded, much less proved; Klebs also rejects Mommsen's theory of a recension by a 'final redactor,' the collection being throughout a product of the period of the Emperors Diocletian and Constantine.

Pp. 465-473. According to J. Beloch, Alcaeus and Sappho were contemporaries, not of Solon, but of Anacreon and the Peisistratidae.

Pp. 474-496. R. von Scala. The proverb in Polybius XXXVIII 8, 9 (τὰ διδόμενα τῇ δεξιᾷ τῇ λαίᾳ χειρὶ δέχεσθαι) goes back to Theodorus ὁ θεός of Cyrene.—C. Wachsmuth shows, against Gutschmid (Kleine Schriften, I), that Diodorus Siculus, XL, frg. 21, contains only a warning to the reading public against a pirated edition of his work, and a notice to booksellers not to sell such copies.—J. Wackernagel. Διπολία, from Δι Πολιῶν, is the true name of the Athenian festival.—J. Schmidt defends his views on the decrees of the Senate of Thisbae (Athen. Mitteil. IV 246) against Dittenberger, Sylloge I 332, and Viereck, Sermo Graecus, p. 15.—B. Kuebler compares Cic. de rep. III 48 for Lucilius 403 L, XIV 1, M.—M. Manitius speaks of the peculiarities in the language and style of Juvenecus and Prudentius.—Th. Birt believes that the vela Iudaica mentioned by Claudian in Eutrop. I 357 were made in Alexandria.—A Zimmermann shows that a change of intervocalic *et* to *#* or *t* in Latin has, especially in proper names, always taken place.

Pp. 497-523. R. Heinze shows that Ariston of Chios has been used by Plutarch in his tractates *περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας* (the leading thought of which is the *αὐτάρκεια* of virtue) and *περὶ εὐθυμίας*, and also by Horace, especially in Epist. I 1 and 2.

Pp. 524-40. K. Zacher. Contributions to the Scholia of Juvenal's Satires 1, 3 and 6. The Codices Pithoeanus and Sangallensis as well as the Schedae Arovienses and the lost MS of Valla are copies of the same MS. The scholia of this original MS are in so bad a condition that emendations and corrections are absolutely necessary, and Zacher proceeds to examine W. Schulz's work in this field, Hermes XXIV 481 foll., adding his own views on I 26, 51, 64, 83, 95, 99; III 11, 34, 67, 79, 102 and VI 83, 91, 188, 251, 264, etc. His conclusion is that the readings adopted by the scholiast are in many cases those of the inferior codices.

Pp. 541-554. O. Hense's article on Ariston in Plutarch has a great many points in common with that of Heinze. Many, perhaps the best parts of Plutarch's *περὶ πολυπραγμοσύνης* are taken from Ariston's works.

Pp. 555-598. J. Beloch examines the account of the Doric migration. The legends of the Thessalian and the Doric migrations cannot have been formed before the end of the eighth century B. C., i. e. after the inhabitants of these

cantons, conscious of their common tribal origin, called themselves by one common name. At the time when epic poetry, which knew not the name Thessaly, knew nothing of the Dorians in Peloponnesus nor of the kings who claimed to be descendants of Herakles, migrated from the coast of Asia Minor to European Greece, the question arose, how did it happen that the conditions under which the Greeks lived, according to the statements of epic poetry, no longer existed? But one answer was possible: Greece had been disturbed by a universal migration of tribes. Beloch proves, point after point, how with this assertion as a basis all the details of the history of that period could be explained. The result of his able discussion is that these myths have no value for the reconstruction of the earliest history of Greece. The Doric migration belongs to the period prior to that when the colonies in Asia Minor were founded. Epic poetry, being later than these events, cannot be considered a historically reliable source for our knowledge of the affairs of European Greece in the earliest time. Neither is it necessary to presume such a change as was brought about by the Doric migration in order to explain the disappearance of the civilization faintly recognized in the relics of art found at Mycenae.

Pp. 599-611. Joh. Schmidt. In the year 1883 M. Cagnat found in the ruins of Hr. ed-Dekr, a district belonging to ancient Simmitthus, an inscription, which was published in the *Archives des Missions scientifiques*, XI 126, and in the *Ephem.* V, No. 498. This inscription is not the decree of a collegium funeraticium, as has been believed thus far, but a part of the statutes of the curia Iovis, the colony of Simmitthus, containing changes and amendments adopted by the concilium Curiale, Novbr. 27, 185 A. D.

Pp. 612-621. V. Gardthausen explains five new inscriptions from Epidauros belonging to the period of the Roman empire, and attempts to complete a Latin inscription, published in *Notiz. d. scavi*, 1890, p. 82.

Pp. 622-636. M. Ihm publishes for the first time a critical edition of the scholia contained in the Codex Mediceus of Vergil. The Vergil MS in the Library at Florence, Plut. 39, 1, beginning with Ecl. VI 48, contains full scholia for the remainder of the Eclogues. Pomponius Sabinus made use of them in his commentary. The scholia are based on a text of Vergil much inferior to that of the Codex Mediceus.

Pp. 637-640. E. Oder treats of the Book on Dreams, by Alexander of Myndos. Alexander is roughly handled by Artemidorus, but this only serves to show that the latter must have copied from him more than he acknowledges. —K. Dziatzko reads the fragment of Plautus in Festus, p. 306, 25 M, *subcenturiatum* require, *qui te delectet domi*. —M. Ihm describes an inscription dedicated to the *matres Suebiae* recently found in Cologne.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

HERMES, 1890.

I.

O. Kern. Die Boeotischen Kabiren. This paper is suggested by recent excavations at Thebes, where a Kabirion was discovered. Kern, in attempting to elucidate the real character of the Kabiri, derives his material largely from vase-paintings and inscriptions of that find. At Thebes, indeed, there

seems to have been but one Kabiros, strongly resembling Dionysos, the local deity of Thebes. Why should Dionysos be the Kabiros? Because he was the central figure of the Eleusinian mysteries and of the esoteric cult of the Orphics. This Kabiros is attended by a young boy, probably his son. On the left side of the same vase-fragment is MITOΣ (=σπέρμα) and KPATEIA, with their little child ΠΠΑΤΟΛΛΑΟΣ, the first man. Kern suggests that the Athenians developed the esoteric Eleusinian cult and theosophy at the time when the physical speculation of the Ionians began to find its way across the Aegean. In that Attic theogony the Kabiri had a place. In conclusion the further suggestion is thrown out that the cult at Samothrace was derived from Boeotia.

Th. Mommsen. Das Diocletianische Edict über die Waarenpreise. Recent discoveries of portions of copies of the text of this imperial decree have been made at Plataea (Mr. John C. Rolfe), at Megara, Lebadea, Atalante, Thespieae, Elatea, Samos, Geronthrae, Thebes, and a revision of the edition in CIL. III 801 has become necessary. Among the details discussed by M. is the chapter of linens and woollens. Linen decidedly predominated at that time. The toga had disappeared, the tunic had been developed into the dalmatic. Purple linen seems to have been chiefly used as a border. Another section of the article pertains to those provisions of the edict which refer to gold. Refined gold is called βρόζη (cf. obrussa); a pound of gold is quoted at 50,000 denarii, or at about \$220. Mommsen computes that the ratio of silver to gold at this time was as 15 to 1. Diocletian's gold coin was $\frac{1}{8}$ pd., about \$3.00+. There was also a coin worth XX or XXI denarii. Mommsen endeavors to solve this incongruity of coinage.

M. Schanz. Die Apollodoreer u. die Theodoreer. Apollodorus of Pergamum taught Octavius at Apollonia, Theodorus of Gadara and Rhodes taught Tiberius while he was in disgrace at Rhodes. Each was at the head of a school and enjoyed vast prestige. The real difference between them, in rhetorical principle and doctrine, even Strabo, 13, 625, professed not to know, and more recently E. Rohde and F. Blass do not seem to have succeeded in sounding the point of difference. Apoll. held that *narratio* (διήγησις) must be considered an essential part of every speech; Theodorus denied this categorical postulate (cf. Anonymus Seguerianus in Spengel, Rhet. Graeci, I, p. 441). Quintilian sided with the Theodoreans, 4, 2, 4: "Plerique semper narrandum putaverunt, quod falsum esse pluribus congitur," etc. Further, it would seem, it was the same school of Apollodorus which considered the *prooemium* an absolute postulate of rhetoric (ibid. Spengel I, p. 431). The Theodoreans also claimed that the order and succession of the four essential parts of an oration were fixed and immovable: *prooemium*, *narratio*, *argumentatio*, *peroratio*. The Apollodoreans in general considered rhetoric a science (ἐπιστήμη); the Theodoreans a faculty or art (τέχνη), versatile and mobile rather than fixed or dogmatic.

Thrämer. Euphorion in Plutarch. Euphorion (librarian of Antiochus the Great, about 220 B. C., born at Chalkis), according to Suidas (v. E.), wrote Chiliades, the fifth book containing oracles fulfilled after one thousand years: συνάγει διὰ χιλίων ἐπῶν (Meineke)—ἐτῶν Codd. χρησμοὺς ἀποτελεσθέντας. At first sight it would seem impossible that a poet of the Alexandrian era could

have quoted enough mythological material to bring out such a theme properly; but Thrämer reasons that one may well take the thousand years approximately, as in the instance quoted in Plutarch, *de sera numinis vindicta*, 12.

A. Krause, Mitau (since deceased). *Beitraege zur Alexandergeschichte*. 1. Explanation of the list of unclean peoples in the Judaizing Pseudo-Callisthenes. 2. On Ephorus, fr. 135. 3. Did Alexander constantly have slingers in his army or not? 4. On the proper use of Arrian and the *λεγόμενα*. 5. On the army of occupation, and the armies of satraps, of Alexander. [This is the most elaborate and important part of the paper.]

G. Knaack. *Analecta*. Notes on Theocritus, various Alexandrine poets, etc.

J. Geffcken. *Die Kallimachoscholia der Ibis*, a paper suggested by Ellis's edition of Ovid's *Ibis*. These scholia in general are poor stuff, still in spots traces of ancient scholarship may be discovered. "Simply to throw the scholia on *Ibis* overboard (p. 96) would be just as great a mistake as to quote them freely. Ellis has not essayed a sifting of them. Still it is possible, if not in all, at least in many cases to separate chaff from wheat and to determine what was the scholiast's own."

G. Kaibel. *Sententiarum Liber Quintus*: Critical and exegetical notes on Cratinus, Alexis, Pseudo-Platonic letters, Lucian, the Anonymus de Herbis (Haupt, *Opuscula* II 475). Nicander is used by K. for the purpose of emendation. In Quintilian 8, 3, 50 K. proposes *ἐλλειψις* for *μείωσις*, *ἐλλειψις* for *MS ΕΜΕΙΥΙC*.—Choricius' orations. Two notes deal with miscellaneous subjects (p. 100). On an inscription from Halicarnassus we see marks of Ionic and of Doric dialect alternately (in lists of tribute of the Delian confederation). Kaibel proposes the following explanation; Halicarnassus was really a union of H. proper with the contiguous commonwealth of the *Σαλμακίταις*, who probably were Ionians. The other note deals with Laureum.

H. Kühlewein, of Ilfeld, the assiduous student of Hippocrates, on the MSS of Hippocrates' *Prognosticon* and a Latin translation of the same, the transl. being of the sixth century A. D., and exhibiting some few traces of the tradition of the Latin into Romance.

E. Curtius. *Wie die Athener Ionier wurden*. The venerable Hellenist enumerates a number of detailed points of worship and religious usage which were brought into Athens from across the Aegean. The Ionic immigrants Curtius conceives as having belonged to a superior scale of society: leaders in their new home, they were men of knightly rank and of bold enterprise. The process of gradual blending, Curtius thinks, was something like the amalgamation of Sabines and Latins in early Rome. Curtius here reasserts the familiar proposition of his *History* that the Ionians had their origin in Asia Minor.

II.

Die Ueberlieferung der Aischylosscholien, v. Wilamowitz. The thesis of W. is this: The dominating position of the Cod. Mediceus is to be maintained unreservedly as far as the text is concerned, but not so exclusively in the sphere of the scholia. There are cases where the scholia in younger MSS are

actually more explicit and complete than passages in the Scholia of the Florentine Codex. In the course of the article Wecklein and Kirchhoff do not escape criticism, e. g. in Schol. on Septem 618 Dind., Persae 525; ib. 370, where the scholia of the younger MSS are palpably superior to the Mediceus Scholia; or in Prom. 42, where the scholia printed by Wilamowitz could hardly be taken as Byzantine padding of the M. Scholia. Similarly in Prom. 519.

P. Wendland. *Die Tendenz des Platonischen Menexenus*. W. believes that by a searching and precise interpretation of the introductory dialogue between Socrates and Menexenus positive results may be gained. Especial stress on the mutual depreciation of ideals and spheres of work that seems to have prevailed between Isocrates and Plato. Cf. e. g. Isocrates c. Sophistae 21: *ὅλος μὲν γὰρ οὐδεμίαν ἡγοῦμαι τοιαύτην εἶναι τέχνην κτέ.* Comp. with Menex. 246 D and Isocr. Nicocl. 2. At that time, probably soon after 387, the two rival schools of Isocrates and Alcidas were at one in following the method of Gorgias. The method of Gorgias is satirized by Plato, and Isocr. reply to the Menex. is to be found in Panegy. 53 (cf. Menex. 244 E), though, after all, Wendland does not go beyond a probability ('durch die Uebereinstimmung der Worte *κατηγορεῖν* und *θεραπεύειν* ist wohl die Bezugnahme auf den Menexenus genügend gesichert'). Analyzing this Epitaphios in detail, W. concludes that 387, the peace of Antalkidas, is the terminus post quem, and 380, the date of the publication of Isocrates' Panegyricus, the terminus ante quem (p. 192). References in Aristotle: Rhet. I 9, 1137b, 8; ib. III 14, 1413b, 30, *ὃ γὰρ λέγει Σωκράτης ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ, ἀληθές, ὅτι οὐ χαλεπὸν Ἀθηναίους ἐν Ἀθηναίοις ἐπαινεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐν Λακεδαιμονίοις.* But Zeller denies that this is a reference to the Menexenus.

v. Wilamowitz. *Zu Plutarch's Gastmahl der Sieben Weisen*. After a clever and suggestive introduction W. turns to his chief purpose, the presentation of emendations of the text; and we are told (p. 199) that the textual criticism of the *Moralia* in general is as yet in a rudimentary stage. W. charges Bernardakis (the editor in Teubner's collection) with decided lack of proper preparation and with servile copying of Hercher, scoring him severely also for not properly making acknowledgment of Treu's critical work. Many emendations are subjoined.

Th. Mommsen. *Die Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (pp. 228-292). This elaborate treatise of Mommsen's was elicited by the paper of Dessau, *Hermes*, Vol. 24, 337 sqq. M. discusses a variety of important points: the authenticity of the chief groups of biographies, time of composition, imitation, forgeries and interpolations, Greek sources, the MS tradition, emendations of his own and a programme for an edition of the kind required for historical students. While Dessau is commended in many details, Mommsen maintains the following view: The collection is not, as Dessau believes, a work of the time of the emperor Theodosius, a work which, by a fiction, presents itself as written in the era of Diocletian and Constantine, but it originated substantially in the latter epoch, and was merely in the following dynasty equipped with a few insertions of relatively slight importance, and recast in spots. "One must not forget . . . that these biographies constitute one of the most contemptible performances of scribblers (*Sudeleien*) that have reached us from

antiquity." Details of verbal usage in official terminology harmonize well with the reputed time of authorship.

The plurality of authors (p. 245) is to be upheld, although the connection of individual biographies with the names of individual authors is partly erroneous, partly at least insufficiently authenticated. We are to distinguish a series of biographies composed in the time of Diocletian and one written under Constantine.

Biographies composed in the era of Diocletian. The nine from Hadrian to Macrinus (p. 246), although 'vielfach zerrüttet,' are genuine sources of history; the seven biographies following are compilations or forgeries drawn from the former. The "documents" found in all the sixteen biographies (p. 251) are forgeries by a different hand.

The second main group of biographies by Trebellius Pollio and others. The authorship is genuine. Dessau's objections on the score of incongruities (Constantius vs. Maxentius, etc.), are overthrown by Mommsen, p. 255: "the principle of adoption, not legitimacy of birth, dominated the political system of the Romans." Pollio probably made ample use of Greek originals, such as Dexippus. The biographies of Aurelianus, Tacitus, Probus, Carus are given as the work of the Syracusan Flavius Vopiscus. There is no substantial reason for doubting his authorship; he probably wrote from 305-306 A. D.

The series from Elagabalus to Gordianus III is ascribed to Lampridius and Capitolinus, but with much less certainty than the preceding. Parallels from Herodianus are pointed out by Mommsen. The leading MSS are two: a Palatinus, now in the Vatican (Vatic. Palat. 899) and one at Bamberg.

Mommsen's paper has a practical corollary (p. 281), a call for a new edition of the *Scriptores H. A.*, suitable for the wants of students of history. "Wie sie (the biographies) jetzt vorliegen, ist man bei dem Gebrauch des ebenso gefährlichen wie unentbehrlichen Buches in steter Verlegenheit und Unsicherheit."

E. G. SIHLER.

JOURNAL ASIATIQUE.¹

Vol. XVII.

Pp. 177-201. Astronomy is the only branch of science cultivated by the Moroccan scholars. It is almost considered a divine art, owing to its great importance for their religious rites and customs; for without its knowledge it would be nigh impossible exactly to determine the hours for prayer and the direction toward Mecca. Among the most useful instruments employed by the Moroccan astronomers are the astrolabes, one of which M. Delphin obtained from Captain Erckmann, formerly chief of the military mission in Fez. This astrolabe was made in the twelfth century of the Hegira. M. Delphin gives a minute description, with photographic reproduction of the instrument, and interprets the inscriptions found on it.

Pp. 202-273, 496-531. M. Joseph Halévy continues his publication of the famous correspondence of Amenophis III and Amenophis IV (A. J. P. XII 254). On p. 241 he mentions the mistake of the Massorites in Ezekiel 27, 9. The city mentioned is not 'Gebal' (Psalm 83, 8, Gabala of Strabo or

¹ See A. J. P. XII 255.

Gebalene of Josephus), but Göbel (גִּבְלָה), Phoenician גִּבְלָה = Greek *Búβλος* and Assyrian Gubla. À propos of the P. N. Abd-aš-ra-tum, also written Abd-a-ši-ir-ti = Hebrew-Phoenician עֲבֵר־אֶשֶׁרֶת, עֲבֵר־אֶשֶׁרֶת, he maintains, with Eb. Schrader, that אֶשֶׁרֶת was originally the name of a goddess. On p. 271 he compares Assyrian Subarina with the Old Testament סִכְרִים, situated between Hamath and Damascus (Ezek. 47, 16), also written סִפְרִים, whence סִפְרִים, wrongly pointed סִפְרִים in II Kings 18, 34 and 19, 13; and סִפְרִים in II Kings 17, 31.

Pp. 274-286. All the lists of Biblical names known in literature as 'Εβραϊκῶν ὀνομάτων ἐρμηνεῖαι' and 'onomastica sacra' owe their origin to the great influence of the allegorical interpretation of Philo of Alexandria upon later Christian scholars. Most of these lists were collected and published by Paul de Lagarde in his 'Onomastica sacra' (Gottingae, 1870; second edition, 1890), a work of rare sagacity and power of combination. Nothing is known of the existence of such lists in the Coptic literature, and only a few remnants are found in the Ethiopic church. These fragments are now published by Professor Adalbert Merx from two MSS belonging to the public library at Frankfurt on the Main. This Ethiopic text is a translation from the Greek as found in Lagarde's publication.

Pp. 287-322 contain some notes on two Arabic MSS, by M. le Baron Carra de Vaux. The first MS is a translation, with many changes, of the tract σφαῖρικὰ, composed by the geometrician Theodosius (A. D. 40-100); the Greek text was edited by John Hunt at Oxford in 1709. The translation by Jahia ibn Muhammed ibn Abi Shukr Almaghrabi, of Andalusia, is dated in the year 906 of the Hegira (A. D. 1500), and divided into three chapters. The second note is on a treatise on 'Clepsydras,' by an anonymous Arabic scholar.

Pp. 323-330. M. Casanova describes a magic cup, made of copper, and containing an Arabic inscription of some historical interest for certain dates in the lives of Noureddin and his famous successor Saladin.

Pp. 357-411. M. Clément-Huart prints a continuation of his summaries of Ottoman bibliography, giving a list of 303 Turkish, Arabic, and Persian books printed in Constantinople during the year 1306-1307 of the Hegira (A. D. 1889-1890). It shows considerable activity in the translation of European prose-fiction into Turkish. The books are classed in the six divisions of (1) theology, religious science and legislation; (2) literature, morals and poetry; (3) history and biography; (4) miscellaneous works; (5) languages, composition and grammar; and (6) periodicals. Dates are generally and prices frequently given.

Pp. 411-495 contain the first instalment of a long article, by M. Max van Berchem, on Arabic archaeology, examining the monuments of the Fatimites and their inscriptions.

Nouvelles et Mélanges.

Vol. XV. Pp. 231-268. M. S. Lévi believes that he has found in the names Âmbhi, Saubhûti, Bhagala, recorded in the Gaṇapatha, the Sanskrit forms of the names of the Hindu princes mentioned by the historians of

Alexander, viz. Omphis, king of Taxila and ally of Alexander the Great, Sophytes, king of the country of Saubhûta and Phegelas (Phegeus, Diod. XVII 93), mentioned by Quintus Curtius, IX 1, 36.—M. Feer discusses a list of 550 Jâtakas, arranged by N. Don de Zilva and published in the *Journal of the Ceylon branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1887.—M. Henry Cordier has an obituary notice of the famous English geographer and traveller, Colonel Sir Henry Yule (born 1 May, 1820, near Edinburgh, and died 30 Dec., 1889).—M. Barbier de Meynard reviews (1) *Un empereur Byzantin au Xe siècle, Nicéphore Phocas*, par Gustave Schlumberger, Paris, 1890, Vol. I, and (2) M. R. Basset's *Loqmân berbère*, Paris, 1890. Both books, of course, will at once occupy their place 'parmi les plus sérieuses et les meilleures contributions.'

Pp. 477-508. M. Joseph Halévy explains the two Mandaean nouns *Pirâ* and *Mânâ* as watermelon and manna. The sacred books of the Mandaeans were originally written in Syriac, and it is only with the help of this language that we can satisfactorily explain the change of Biblical names as found in these books. M. Halévy also explains *Nu-ha-ši*, occurring in the inscriptions found at Tell-El-Amarna and denoting a region of Syria, by 'the land of copper.'—M. Duval explains two Nabatean expressions: (1) A number of inscriptions begin with the phrase בלל; this he explains as a contraction of באללה=by God!; (2) מסגד, occurring in these texts, is not equal to the Arabic masjid, whence English mosque, but means 'altar.'—M. C. Imbault-Huart (1) describes the contents of a Chinese drama of the seventeenth century, in prose and in verse, entitled 'the two soles' or 'actor through love'; (2) publishes a translation of a Chinese story called 'the guardians of the door.'—M. Édouard Montet speaks of some unpublished works of the late Arabic scholar Jean Humbert, of Geneva (Switzerland).—M. Clém. Huart reviews M. Derenbourg's *Ousâma ibn Mounkid. Un émir syrien au I^{er} siècle des Croisades* (1095-1188), Part I, Paris, 1889.

Vol. XVI.

Pp. 355-378. M. E. Drouin reviews: An inscribed seal of Kumara Gupta II, found near Bhitari, by V. A. Smith and Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle; and: Report on old silver coins discovered in Mârwarâ, by Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, Calcutta, 1889. Both publications are very important for the chronology of ancient India.—M. B. de Meynard highly recommends (1) MM. Sachau and Ethé's *Catalogue of the Persian MSS in the Bodleian Library*, Part I, Oxford, 1890; and (2) *Choix de Fables traduites en Arabe parlé*, par Mejdoub ben Kalafat, Constantine, 1890.—M. S. Lévi calls attention to 'The history of civilization in ancient India, based on Sanscrit literature,' by Romesh Chunder Dutt, of the Bengal Civil Service, etc. In three volumes. Vol. I, Calcutta, 1889. It is written in a popular style, but shows great zeal and industry, learning and devotion, and deserves all credit.

Pp. 538-560. M. J. Oppert reads two communications: (1) on the date of the Greek king Kamnaskires, which an astronomical text fixes for the year 225 of the Seleucidæan era, and (2) On the conventional reading of *Iz-du-bar* for the name of the Babylonian Nimrod, the Chaldean Perseus. A tablet, recently discovered by Pinches, shows the reading: An-iz-tu-maš. | An Gi-il-

ga-meš. It is the same Gilgames mentioned by Aelian in his *Hist. Anim.* XII 21.—M. S. Lévi. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* VI 104, mentions the Hindu king Coelobothras. Some of the oldest MSS give the variant Celebethonas (or Celebechonas). This M. Lévi considers to be the original reading, and identifies it with the name of Çalavâdhana or Çalavâhana, a by-form to the name of the illustrious Çalivâhana who defeated the Çakas in the year 78 A. D. But M. Vinson raises a number of historical, geographical and palaeographical objections against this identification (*J. A.* XVII 158). Vol. XVII, pp. 337-339, M. Lévi answers M. Vinson, without, however, convincing the latter. In a second note M. Lévi treats of the date of Vasubandhu (sixth century B. C.).—There is a review, by M. J. de Goeje, of Professor A. F. Mehren's *Traité des mystiques d'Abou Ali al-Hosein B. Abdallah B. Sinâ ou d'Avicenne. Texte arabe avec l'explication en français.* Part I, Leyden, 1889.

Vol. XVII.

Pp. 140-176. The two principal kingdoms of ancient Armenia were Uraṛtu and Minni, called in the Biblical records Ararat and Minni. These two names suddenly disappeared after the conquest of the country by the Persians, and the name Arminia is used in their stead. M. Darmesteter believes that Arminia is an artificial contraction of the two names Ar(arat) + Min(ni), made by the Persian authorities for the sake of convenience. [A parallel case is that of our Pen-Mar = Pennsylvania-Maryland.]—M. E. Drouin reads a note on the coins stamped by the Touranian princes from the third to the seventh century of our era. The coins prove the use, at the same time, of at least five different alphabets among the Touranian people who occupied Turkestan, Irân and the valleys of the rivers Caboul and Indus.—M. l'abbé Quentin prints cuneiform text, transliteration and translation of a tablet preserved in the Louvre Museum. This inscription mentions a king Sil-ha-ak, for whom no place can be found in the Assyrian chronology. M. Oppert believes that he must be inserted between the years 667 and 661 B. C., a period in which Assyrian chronology shows a lacuna. [The reading Silhak is by no means certain, it could also be read Tar-hak, etc.]—M. O. Houdas reviews (1) *Recueil de thèmes et versions (arabe parlé) par Allaoua ben Yahya; Mostagenem*, 1890; and (2) *Cours gradué de thèmes français-arabes*, par Auguste Mouliéras, Paris, 1890.—M. C. de Harlez speaks of the nature of the Yi-king and its interpretation.—M. B. de Meynard reviews (1) O. Houdas' *Chrestomathie maghrébie*, Paris, 1891; (2) N. Mallouf's *Grammaire élémentaire de la langue turque*, 2^e édition, Paris, 1889, and (3) R. Youssouf's *Dictionnaire portatif turc-français de la langue usuelle, en caractères latins et turcs*. Constantinople, 1890. All the three publications are recommended to students of Oriental languages.

Pp. 331-356. M. B. de Meynard considers the '*Lettres de Bedi'ez-zeman (Hamadani) avec commentaire explicatif et littéraire*, Beyrouth, 1890, 545 pages, 8°, a worthy companion to the *Maqamat of Hamadani*, published by the same Jesuit fathers in 1890 (*A. J. P.* XI 257).—M. Fr. V. Scheil believes that the phrase (amelûti) çabê Ya-u-du, occurring in a letter among the Tell-El-Amarna tablets, written by Aziri, an Egyptian prefect, to his father Dudu (cf. *J. A.* XVII, p. 236), has reference to the Jews. Of great importance

would be the fact that in our letter (No. 39) the determinative is neither mâtu (country) nor âlu (city), but amelûti (people) augmented by çabê (warriors).—M. E. Drouin reviews 'Taḡvīm-i-Meskoukât-i-Osmānieh ou traité de numismatique ottomane,' par Ismaïl Ghālīb Edhēm Bey, Constantinople, 1307 Hég., 510 pages, 8°; and M. J. Halévy has a note on the recent book of Dr. Karl Albrecht, *Die im Taḡkemōnī vorkommenden Angaben über Juda Harizī's Leben, Studien und Reisen*. The book is based on the text of Taḡkemōnī as published by Paul de Lagarde.

Pp. 532-546. M. Clermont-Ganneau contributes philological and historical observations on the recently discovered Nabatean inscriptions (cf. especially *Z. A.*, 1890, p. 289).—M. Jules Oppert shows that the destruction of the monuments of Babylon by Xerxes, upon his return from Greece, is explained by the fact that several Babylonian contracts are dated during the reign of king Šamaš-irib, contemporary of Xerxes. It is probable that this prince became king of Babylon during the revolution against Xerxes after the battle at Salamis, 480 B. C. When Xerxes, upon his return, conquered Babylon, the monuments of the city were partly destroyed.—In *Stade's Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* XI 99 ff., K. Budde proposed to read in Exodus 21, 8 יִדְעָה instead of יִשְׁדָּח; ib. 34 בָּקָה for בָּקָה, and 22 בְּפָלִים for בְּפָלִים, and in chapter 22, 30 וּבִשְׂרָה טָרְפָה for וּבִשְׂרָה טָרְפָה. To these emendations M. Halévy objects, as inconsistent with the genius and grammar of the Hebrew language. On the other hand, he praises B.'s placing 20, 2b after 22, 3, and thinks that 22, 1-2a will join to these very neatly; his re-arrangement of Exod. 22, 18-17 is commended; the reading of רַב in 23, 2 for רַב offers a nice antithesis to רַב in the following verse; and considering the words לִנְטוֹת אַחֲרֵי רַבִּים (verse 2) as a dittography, this second verse would be translated: 'Neither shalt thou speak against the great (rich) to make justice deviate, nor shalt thou countenance a poor man in his cause.'

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

BRIEF MENTION.

In a recent number of the *Journal* (XI 389) I said touching Sidney's Greek scholarship: 'A first-hand knowledge of the Greek authors whom Sidney cites is not made evident by the character of his references.' Since then I have chanced on Henri Estienne's dedication of his edition of Herodian (1581) to Sidney, from which it is tolerably evident that the great scholar was a little afraid lest the accomplished courtier should have let his Greek slip. *Quamvis autem*, he says, *is sis (si modo te aula non mutavit ab illo quem in Germania primum, deinde in Austria cognovi) qui, si hunc scriptorem in manus sumas, interpretis opera carere possis: tamen eorum quae circa interpretationem in gratiam eorum praestiti qui non itidem sine cortice (ut est in proverbio) natare queunt, tibi quoque iucundam fore lectionem confido.*

One of my favorite illustrations of the insufficiency of English-Greek dictionaries has been for many years the word 'between,' as in the phrase 'war between,' which cannot be translated by the help of Franz or Yonge, whether under 'between' or under 'war.' The Greek, confiding in the common sense of his reader, sometimes contents himself with a copulative conjunction. πόλεμον Χαλκιδέων καὶ Ἐρετριέων, says Thukydides (I, 15, 3), and it suffices. Xen. says (Hell. 3, 2, 31) ὁ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἑλλήνων πόλεμος, and it suffices. In the very first line of Thukydides we read Θ. Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων, and, if the first book had been as unlucky as the fourth, some one would have bracketed as unnecessary the following words ὡς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους. Sometimes a preposition is employed, and we find in Thukydides ἐς, as I, 55, 3, τοῦ πολέμου τοῖς Κορινθίοις ἐς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους. But πρὸς is the great favorite, and no wonder; for πρὸς is the favorite preposition with persons and personifications, and without personality of some sort reciprocity is impossible. πρὸς brings the parties face to face, πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον, if I may be allowed to quote the New Testament on such an occasion; it brings the parties face to face and leaves them to settle the matter. Which party is the assailant depends on the context. In Th. I, 50, 1: ναυμαχία γὰρ αὕτη Ἑλλήσι πρὸς Ἑλλήνας, it seems to be a matter of indifference. We find I, 13, 4: ναυμαχία Κορινθίων πρὸς Κερκυραίων, I, 18, 1: μάχη Μήδων πρὸς Ἀθηναίων, I, 100, 1: ναυμαχία Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν ξυμμάχων πρὸς Μήδους, and other passages cited in Grundström, de usu praepositionis πρὸς apud Thucydidem. It is this use of πρὸς that Professor Lamberton, in his πρὸς with accusative (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1891), thinks is not stated with sufficient distinctness nor so generally understood as it ought to be, especially when there is an 'apparent syntactical reversal,' as he calls it, and the reflex action is the more important. Under πόλεμος he cites the well-known passage Dem. 18, 262: ἦν γὰρ ἀσπονδος καὶ ἀκήρυκτος ἡμῖν πρὸς

τοὺς θεατὰς πόλεμος, with the comment: "It was the audience surely that 'made war' on the actors, and not the actors on the audience." True, but the Greek does not commit itself to that. πρὸς τοὺς θεατὰς was translated by our ancestors 'cum spectatoribus,' and translated correctly. Of course it must needs be that misunderstandings come, and Professor Lamberton says that 'Franke actually proposed to alter ὑμᾶς into ὑμῶν' in Lys. 10, 22: τίνας δυντός ἐμοὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐγκλήματος. But he forgets to add that Frohberger sets Franke right by citing for ἐγκλημα πρὸς w. acc., not only Lys. 16, 10 and Dem. 1, 7, but other instances outside of the oratorical range to which Professor Lamberton confines himself. To be sure ἐγκλημα does not so clearly involve mutuality except so far as all complaints involve two parties, and in such cases as ἐγκλημα trouble might arise, but nobody ever did, nobody ever could well misunderstand Isokr. 8, 38: τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀπέχθειαν, correctly rendered by old translators and new *vestra offensio*. See Lutz, Die Praepositionen bei den attischen Rednern, p. 163. But by citing Lutz I do not mean to intimate that he has exhausted the subject, nor that Professor Lamberton's essay may not be read with profit by the side of Lutz. Indeed, Lutz limits himself to statistics and to striking instances, but under the latter he has omitted the most remarkable use of πρὸς, and one which Professor Lamberton has not failed to emphasize, Lys. 14, 2: πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῖν διαφορᾶς οὐσης, where πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας = πατρίων. The brachylogy was correctly explained by Reiske, but it is none the less a strong stretch of πρὸς. Professor Lamberton renders 'Our fathers being already at loggerheads,' with which I have little fault to find. Only 'already' is the German 'schon,' and 'at loggerheads' is not Lysianic.

As the opt. may be used in an imperative sense, and as the opt. with ἄν is familiarly employed in a similar way, a large proportion of the so-called potential optatives or opt.=opt. with ἄν may be set down under this head and dismissed without further ado. See my Pindar, Introductory Essay, civ. But what are we to do with Pindar O 11, 21: τὸ γὰρ | ἐμφνὲς οὐτ' αἰδῶν ἀλώπηξ | οὐτ' ἐρίβρομοι λέοντες διαλλάξαντο Φῆθος? A few months after the publication of my edition I found in an article of Schroeder's (Jahresbericht des Berliner Philologenvereins, 1885, p. 357), the simple and evident correction διαλλάξαντο (gnomic aorist), which sets matters right by a stroke of the pen. It is just these easy emendations that are so rarely made and so poorly circulated, and I find WILAMOWITZ saying in his *Commentariolum Grammaticum* IV: 'διαλλάξαντο pro soloeco optativo neminem restituisse saepius in scholis questus sum; nuper vidi verum a Lehrsio Mus. Rhen. 30, 93 breviter esse indicatum.' Another 'potential' opt. which was brought into the Pindaric text by Hermann for an unmetrical IKOMAN (P. 4, 118) is put aside by Lehrs in the same place. Madvig had proposed ἱκνοῦμαι or ἱκάνω, and Lehrs betters the lesson by ἱκάνων. But after all ἱκοιμ' ἄν is far from hopeless. Comp. I 414, and see A. J. P. VII 272. In the same *Commentariolum* Wilamowitz makes another pretty emendation by striking out a comma in the same poem (v. 3) and reading οὐρανίῳ ὑδάτων ὁμβρίων παίδων νεφέλας, and not ὁμβρίων, παίδων νεφέλων. This is in accordance with the conception of the scholiasts: παῖδας νεφελῶν τοὺς ὁμβροὺς φησί. This has the true Pindaric ring. Cf. O 2, 13: ἀλλ' ὦ Κρόνιε παῖ 'Ρέας. This is the kind of emendation which one would like to recommend to Mr. Bury instead of the wanton generation of new Greek words and

unheard-of Greek forms. By the way, if any man desires to be avenged of a philological adversary he need only await Wilamowitz's leisure, for annihilation at his hands is merely a question of time. *Omnes eodem cogimur*. It is Bornemann's turn now, and as Bornemann, enraged by the quiet way in which I had put aside one of his emendations, fell on my Pindar with the malevolence of his tribe, I find myself able to read with Christian resignation what Wilamowitz has written: *Puderet me mei ipsius si Bornemannis aliquid persuadere vellem*.

It will be seen from what has been said above that I am only too glad to get rid of a potential optative by anything that can be considered fair means. In prose I have little scruple in restoring *άν*, and if there is any ground for suspecting haplography, I have no scruple at all. No scruple at all? In the silent watches of the night, I must confess, the cacophony of *ANAN* does haunt me, and I ask how many Greek words begin that way (see A. J. P. III 453). But the potential optatives in verse are not so accommodating, for the critic has to say to himself there *μέτρῳ κατάβαινε*. The comparatively large *οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως* group being negative may be accounted for by an equation with *οὐκ άν, πῶς άν*, and nearly all the rest present the curious phenomenon of an *AN* somewhere, an *EI* somewhere, so that the ear is satisfied and the mind cheated. Aisch. Cho. 594: *ὑπέρτολμον Ἀνδρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγοι*; Soph. Antig. 604: *τεAN, Ζεῦ, δύνασιν τίς Ἀνδρῶν ὑπερβασία κατὰσχοι*; Eur. Andr. 929: *πῶς οὖν τάδ', ὥς Εἰποι τίς, ἐξημέραντες*; Ar. Av. 179: *ὥσπερ Εἰποι τίς τόπος*. But this explanation was intended for the midsummer number, and I will not pursue the theme lest 'the whole quire' of grammarians

hold their hips and loffe
And waxen in their mirth.

Dr. HOLDEN's successive editions show the same leading characteristics with great steadiness, and it is hard to notice a new book of his without falling into the old style of comment and repeating what has been said in other issues of the Journal. In turning over the concluding volume of his *Cyropaedia* (Cambridge, At the University Press; N. Y., Macmillan & Co.) one notes the same fulness of grammatical comment, the same eagerness to keep up with the advance of the times. In this laudable effort the new edition of Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*, with its liberal incorporation of recent results, has lightened Dr. Holden's burden very much, but here and there the doctrine has not been heeded, and the comment on 7, 1, 18: *πάντες ἐροῦσι τὸ λοιπὸν μηδὲν εἶναι κερδαιώτερον ἀρετῆς*, is almost as unsatisfactory as if the article on *μή* in L. and S., 7th ed., as if the article on the encroachment of *μή* on *οὐ* in the first number of this Journal (1880), as if Goodwin, M. and T., §685 had not become common property. In A. J. P. I, 49 (note) the *μή* of Plat. Gorg. 449, one of Dr. Holden's examples, is explained on the principle of apposition with *τοῦτο*. Comp. Plat. Rpb. 6, 497 B: *τοῦτο καὶ ἐπαιτῶμαι, μηδεμίαν ἀξίαν εἶναι τῶν νῦν κατὰστασιν πᾶσι φιλοσόφον φύσεως*, though it would be easy to claim for the latter passage the judicial force which we find in *καταγινώσκω* (X. Kyr. 6, 1, 36, Thuk. 7, 51, 1, cf. 4, 72, 4), that judicial force which Dr. Holden does not recognize in Plat. Apol. 21 A: *ἀνείλεν ἢ Πυθία μηδένα σοφώτερον εἶναι*. Wherever 'the utterance strives to make the statement good and the thought is at once a wish' there

μή is prone to intrude on the sphere of *οὐ*, and we must be on the watch for these shifting moods. But this is an old story, and I should not have repeated it if a fresh reading of Thukydides had not renewed my amazement at the boggling, blinking and slurring of the commentators in the matter of the Thukydidean negatives.

Nor does Herodotus fare much better. So Mr. STRACHAN, in his recent edition of *Herodotus VI* (N. Y., Macmillan & Co., 1891), stumbles over so simple a problem as the oracular *μή* in c. 66: *ἐκπνευε μή Ἀρίστωνος εἶναι Δημόφρον*, a pretty contrast to the *φᾶς οὐκ ἔωτρον εἶναι* of the preceding chapter. And yet Mr. Strachan's edition seems to be exceptionally good of its kind. He is alive to all the recent questions, he has consulted the freshest authorities, and his little volume is not to be classed with the manufactured schoolbooks that are the despair of the reviewer.

In the new edition of his *Homeric Grammar* (Oxford, The Clarendon Press; New York, Macmillan & Co.) Mr. MONRO says, under §297, what he said nine years ago: 'It is evident that a conditional clause of this kind' (*πρίν* with subj.) 'can only occur after a negative principal clause.' But in a note (p. 401) he wakes up to the fact that in the Law of Gortyn *πρίν* κα with the subj. is repeatedly used after an affirmative principal clause; see Baunack, *Die Inschrift von Gortyn*, p. 82. If Mr. Monro had not relied so absolutely on Sturm and Goodwin, and had read the note in this Journal, VI 482, in connection with my article on *πρίν*, II 480, the matter might possibly have appeared to him in a different light. But the revision of the syntactical part of the *Homeric Grammar* has not been thorough enough to warrant the hope of so careful a scrutiny of current work.

'Insbesondere,' says H. LATTMANN, in his interesting treatise, *Selbständiger und bezogener Gebrauch der Tempora im Lateinischen* (p. 114), 'ist zu beachten dass die alte Regel, der Conjunctivus Futuri werde neben einem Futurum (oder futurischen Ausdrücke) durch den Conjunctivus Praesentis, neben anderen Zeiten durch das Partic. Futuri mit *sim* vertreten, unrichtig ist. Der Conj. Praesentis erscheint an Stelle eines unabhängigen Futurum nur dann, wenn es im Verhältnis der Gleichzeitigkeit zu der futurischen Handlung des Hauptsatzes steht. Nur als Potentialis oder Finalis kann es auch neben einem Futurum den Sinn der Nachzeitigkeit haben. Wo aber bloss oblique Beziehung (oder blosse Unterordnung) den Conjunctiv verlangt, wird die Beziehung der Nachzeitigkeit auch neben einem Futurum durch Part. Futuri mit *sim* bezeichnet.' Then follow examples and an explanation of the reasons why this usage has not been regarded. I rub my eyes. In the first ed. of my Grammar (1867) I said (§298 R): 'whenever the interval between the dependent future and the leading future is to be marked, the periphrastic tense must be employed,' and in the revised ed. (1872): 'whenever the dependent future is subsequent to the leading future, the periphrastic tense must be employed' (§514). I rub my eyes, for up to this time I never dreamed that so simple and common-sense a rule needed an especial emphasis.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Mitchell (Ellen M.) *A Study of Greek Philosophy*; with introd. by W. Rounseville Alger. Chicago, *S. C. Griggs & Co.*, 1891. 28 + 282 pp. 12mo. \$1.25.

Strong (Herbert A.), Logeman (W. S.) and Wheeler (B. Ide). *Introduction to the Study of the History of Language*. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1891. 8vo, cl., \$3.50.

Xenophon. *The Retreat of the Ten Thousand*; being the story of Xenophon's Anabasis, by Prof. C. Witt; tr. by Frances Younghusband; preface by H. G. Dakyns. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1891. II. maps, pl. 8vo, cl., \$1.25.

ENGLISH.

Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens. Trans. by E. Poste. Cr. 8vo, 108 pp. *Macmillan*. 3s. 6d.

— on the Athenian Constitution. Trans., with introd. and notes, by F. G. Kenyon. Post 8vo, 127 pp. *G. Bell & Sons*. 4s. 6d.

— Constitution of Athens. Translated by Thomas J. Dymes. Cr. 8vo, 160 pp. *Seeley*. 2s. 6d.

Chambers's Encyclopaedia. New ed. Vol. 7. Maltebrun to Pearson. Imp. 8vo, 828 pp. *Chambers*. 10s.; hf. mor. 15s.

Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, including the newly discovered poems of Herodas. With autotype facsimiles. 8vo. *Clarendon Press*. 7s. 6d.

Dyer (L.) *Studies of the Gods in Greece at certain Sanctuaries recently excavated*. Cr. 8vo, 462 pp. *Macmillan*. net, 8s. 6d.

Euripides. *Iphigeneia in Aulis*. Ed., with introd. and critical explanatory notes, by E. B. England. 8vo, 186 pp. *Macmillan*. 7s. 6d.

Homer. *Iliad*. Trans. into English prose by John Purves. Ed. with an introd. by Evelyn Abbott. 8vo. *Percival*. net, 18s.

Mahaffy (Rev. J. P.) *A History of Classical Greek Literature*. Vol. 1, 2 Pts. Third ed., revised and enlarged. Cr. 8vo, 570 pp. *Macmillan*. ea. 4s. 6d.

Monro (D. B.) *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*. Second ed., revised and enlarged. 8vo, 444 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 14s.

Plautus. *Captivi*. With introd. and notes by A. R. S. Hallidie. 12mo, 270 pp. *Macmillan*. 3s. 6d.

Pope (G. U.) *First Lessons in Tamil*. Fifth ed. Cr. 8vo, 272 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 7s. 6d.

Quintilian. *Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus*: A revised text, with introductory essays, critical and explanatory notes, and a facsimile of the Harleian MS, by W. Peterson. 8vo, 310 pp. *Clarendon Press*. 12s. 6d.

Thucydides. Book 2. Edit. by E. C. Marchant. 12mo, 364 pp. *Macmillan*. 3s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Amélineau (E.) Notice sur le papyrus gnostique Bruce. In-4. *Imprimerie nationale*. *C. Klincksieck*. 10 fr.

Arbois de Jubainville (H. d'). Les Noms gaulois chez César et Hirtius. Avec la collaboration de E. Ernault et G. Dottin. 1re série: les Composés dont rix est le dernier terme. In-12. *Bouillon*. 4 fr.

Audouin (E.) Étude sommaire des dialectes grecs littéraires. Préface par O. Riemann. In-12. *C. Klincksieck*. Cart. 3 fr.

Baron (Ch.) Le Pronom relatif et la conjonction en grec. Gr. in-8. *A. Picard*. 5 fr.

Bos (le Dr. A.) Glossaire de la langue d'oïl (XI-XIV siècles). Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 16 fr.

En-Nesawi (Mohammed). Histoire du sultan Djelal ed-din Mankobirti. Texte arabe publié par O. Houdas. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 15 fr.

Hông-Liáng-Kih. Histoire géographique des seize royaumes. Ouvrage traduit du chinois et annoté par A. Des Michels. 1er fascicule. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 7 fr. 50.

La Grasserie (Raoul de). Études de grammaire comparée. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 8 fr.

Nicole (Jules). Les Scolies genevoises de l'Iliade. 2 vol. in-8. Genève, *Hachette*. 35 fr.

Nizam Oul-Mouk (le vizir). Siasset Namèh. Texte persan édité par Ch. Shefer. Gr. in-8. *Leroux*. 15 fr.

Petit (Arsène). La Grammaire de la lecture à haute voix. In-12. *Hetsel*. 3 fr.

Rougé (Jacques de). Géographie ancienne de la Basse-Egypte. In-8. *Rothschild*. 20 fr.

Saadya. Commentaire sur le Séfer Yesira par Saadya de Fayoum, publié et traduit par Mayer Lambert. Gr. in-8. *Bouillon*. 10 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Hrsg. v. Rich. Förster. 6. Bd., 1. u. 2. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *W. Koebner*. m. 5. Inhalt: 1. De Tacitei de oratoribus dialogi codicum nexu et fide, scripsit Dr. Fridericus Scheuer. Accedit codicis Vindobonensis DCCXI collatio. viii, 49 S. m. 2.—2. De Q. Aurelii Symmachi studiis graecis et latinis scripsit Dr. Guilelmus Kroll. 99 S. m. 3.

Acta martyrum et sanctorum. Syriace ed. Bedjan. Tomus II. Martyres Chaldaei et Persae. gr. 8. xiii, 688 S. Parisiis. Leipzig, *Harrassowitz in Comm.* m. 24. (I. u. II. m. 44.)

Arnold (Thdr.) Die griechischen Studien d. Horaz. Neu. hrsg. v. Wilh. Fries. gr. 8. xiii, 143 S. Halle a-S., *Buchh. d. Waisenhausen*. m. 2.

Aufrecht (Thdr.) An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works and Authors. gr. 8. viii, 795 S. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus' Sort.* m. 36.

Bartholomae (Chr.) Studien zur indogermanischen Sprachgeschichte. II. gr. 8. Halle a-S., *M. Niemeyer.* m. 7. (1. u. 2. m. 12.) Inhalt: I. Indogermanisch sk u. skh. II. Altindisch *āsiṣ* > lateinisch *erās*. vi, 262 S.

Bauer (Adf.) Literarische u. historische Forschungen zu Aristoteles *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*. gr. 8. vii, 190 S. München, *C. H. Beck.* m. 3.

Bibliothek, altfranzösische. 12. Bd. 8. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland.* m. 250. (1-12. m. 69.30.) Inhalt: Floris et Liriope, altfranzösischer Roman d. Robert de Blois. Zum ersten Mal hrsg. von Dr. Wolfram v. Zingerle. xxx, 52 S.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. 3. Bd., 2. Abth., 1. Lfg. gr. 4. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 18. (I, 1-4. II, III, 1. u. 2. I, IV-VI u. IX. m. 332.) Inhalt: Das babylonische Nimrodepos. Keilschrifttext der Bruchstücke der sogenannten Izdubarlegenden m. dem keilinschriftl. Sintfluthberichte. Nach den Originalen im brit. Museum copirt u. hrsg. v. Paul Haupt. 2. Abth., den Keilschrifttext der XI. u. XII. Taf. wie der seit 1882 neugefundenen od. vervollständ. Fragmente enth. 1. Lfg. S. 79-159. Nr. 43-72.

Bibliothek, hellenische, unter Red. v. H. C. Müller u. A. J. Flament. 1. Thl. 1. Bd. gr. 8. Leiden, *E. J. Brill.* m. 4. Inhalt: Historische Grammatik der hellenischen Sprache, v. H. C. Müller. In 2 Bdn., 1. Bd. Grammatik. viii, 227 S.

Bibliothek, romanische, hrsg. v. Wendelin Foerster. Nr. 4-6. 8. Halle a-S., *M. Niemeyer.* m. 11. (1-6. m. 22.) Inhalt: 4. Wistasse le Moine. Altfranzösischer Abenteuerroman d. XIII. Jahrh. Nach der einz. Pariser Handschrift v. Neuem hrsg. v. Wendelin Foerster u. Joh. Trost. xxxi, 88 S. m. 3.—5. Kristian v. Troyes, Yvain [Der Löwenritter]. Neue verb. Textausg. m. Einleitg. u. Glossar. Hrsg. v. W. Foerster. xxiv, 187 S. m. 4.—6. Das Adams-spiel. Anglonormannisches Gedicht d. 12. Jahrh., m. e. Anh.: Die 15 Zeichen d. jüngsten Gerichts. Hrsg. v. D. Karl Grass. viii, 174 S. m. 4.

Blümner (Hugo). Studien zur Geschichte der Metapher im Griechischen. 1. Hft. Ueber Gleichniss u. Metapher in der attischen Komödie. gr. 8. xix, 287 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 8.

Bourquin (Thdr.) Grammatik der Eskimo-Sprache. gr. 8. xx, 415 S. Gnadau, *Unitäts-Buchh.* geb. m. 27.

Cappeller (Carl). A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, based upon the St. Petersburg lexicons. gr. 8. viii, 672 S. Strassburg i-E., *K. J. Trübner Verl.* geb. in Leinw. m. 21.

Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae Borussicae. Vol. IV, pars III. Lex.-8. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* m. 7. Inhalt: Ammonius, in Porphyrii isagogen sive V voces. Ed. Adf. Busse. xlv, 133 S. (IV, 1-3. m. 20.80.)

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, consilio et auctoritate Academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. III, suppl. II. et vol. VIII, suppl. I. Fol. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* m. 81. Inhalt: III. Inscriptionum Orientis et Illyrici latinarum supplementum edd. Thdr. Mommsen, Otto Hirschfeld, Alfr. Domaszewski. Fasc. II. S. 1373-1667. m. 29. (Vol. III cum suppl. I et II. m. 154.)—VIII. Inscriptionum Africae proconsularis latinarum supplementum

edd. Renatus Cagnat et Joas. Schmidt, commentariis instruxit Joas. Schmidt. S. 1143-1666. kart. m. 52. (Vol. VIII cum. suppl. m. 148.)

Culex, carmen Vergilio ascriptum recensuit et enarravit Fridericus Leo. Accedit Copa elegia. 8. 122 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 3.

Dieterich (Albr.) Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte d. späteren Altertums. gr. 8. vi, 221 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4.40.

Dionysi Halicarnasensis antiquitatum romanarum quae supersunt, ed. Carolus Jacoby. Vol. III. 8. iii, 400 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3. (I-III. m. 9.60.)

Du Cange. Carolus du Fresne, glossarium. Anastat. Neudr. Fasc. 10. [Finis.] Fol. (Appendix et Etymologicon vocabulorum Sp. 47-316.) Breslau, *W. Koebner*. à m. 9.60.

Eisenlohr (Aug.) E. mathematisches Handbuch der alten Aegypter [Papyrus Rhind d. British Museum], übers. u. erklärt. 2. Ausg. [ohne Tafeln]. gr. 4. iv, 278 S. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 12.

Euripides. Hippolytos. Griechisch u. deutsch von Ulr. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. gr. 8. 245 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 8.

Gardthausen (V.) Augustus u. seine Zeit. In 2 Thln. à 2 Bde. I. Thl., 1. Bd. u. II. Thl., 1. Halbbd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 16. I, 1 (x, 481 S. m. Titelbild.) m. 10.—II, 1 (276 S.) m. 6.

Goebel (Ed.) Homerische Blätter. Lexikologische, krit. u. exeget. Beiträge zu Homer. gr. 4. 24 S. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*. m. —80.

Graf (Ernst). Rythmus u. Metrum. Zur Synonymik. gr. 8. iv, 97 S. Marburg i-H., *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 2.40.

Ἡσιόδου τὰ ἅπαντα ἐξ ἐρμηνείας Καρόλου Σίττλ. (Zwyscheits 'Ελληνικὴ βιβλιοθήκη, τόμος γ'.) gr. 8. xiii, 645 S. m. 1 Bildnis in Heliograv. u. 1 Fksm. 'Αθήνησιν, 1889. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 10.

Immerwahr (Walt.) Die Kulte u. Mythen Arkadiens. In 2 Bdn. 1. Bd. Die arkad. Kulte. gr. 8. vi, 288 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 4.

Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini graecae et latinae. Iussu et impensis societatis archaeologicae imperii russici ed. M. Basiliius Latyshev. Vol. II. Inscriptiones regni bosporani continens. Imp. 4. lvi., 351 S. m. 2 farb. Karten. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* m. 30. (I. u. II. m. 50.)

Jackson (A. V. Williams). The Avestan Alphabet and its Transcription. With appendices. gr. 8. 36 S. Stuttgart, *W. Kohlhammer*, 1890. m. —80.

Koch (C. Frdr.) Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache. 3. Bd. gr. 8. Kassel, *G. H. Wigand*. m. 10. Inhalt: Die Wortbildung der englischen Sprache. 2. Aufl., zum Drucke besorgt v. Rich. Wülker. xxiv, 452 S.

Körting (Gust.) Lateinisch-romanisches Wörterbuch. 9. u. 10. Lfg. Lex.-8. vii, Sp. 781-828 u. Wortverzeichnisse S. 113-174. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*. à m. 2 (klpt. m. 22.)

Lehrbücher der germanischen Philologie. I. Bd. gr. 8. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 5. Inhalt: Germanische Mythologie v. Elard Hugo Meyer. xi, 354 S.

Lehrbücher d. Seminars f. orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin. Hrsg. v. dem Director d. Seminars. 4. u. 5. Bd. gr. 8. Berlin, *W. Spemann*, geb. in Leinw. m. 32. (1-5. m. 79.50). Inhalt: 4. Japanisches Lesebuch. Märchen

u. Erzählgn. in japan. Umgangssprache u. latein. Umschrift, nebst Anmerkgn. u. Wörterbuch v. Herm. Plaut. xvi, 428 S. m. 20.—5. Praktische Grammatik der neugriechischen Schrift- u. Umgangssprache, m. Übungsstücken u. Gesprächen v. J. K. Mitsotakis. xii, 260 S. m. 12.

Libanii apologia Socratis. Rec. notisque instruxit Y. H. Rogge. gr. 8. v, 96 S. Amsterdam, *J. Müller*. m. 3.60.

Lieblein (J.) Dictionnaire de noms hiéroglyphiques en ordre généalogique et alphabétique. 3. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 557-932 autogr. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 30. (1-3. m. 75.)

Mayer (A.) Übungen d. lateinischen Stils [im Anschluss an die Lektüre d. Corn. Nepos u. C. Jul. Caesar]. 5. u. 6. Schulj. [Tertia]. gr. 8. xvi, 404 S. Freiburg i-Br., *Herder*. m. 3; einbd. in Halbldr. m. —40.

Miller (Ant.) Die Alexandergeschichte nach Strabo. 2. Tl. gr. 4. ii, 25 S. Würzburg, *Stahel*. m. 1.50. (1. u. 2. m. 4.)

Neubauer (Ad.) Petite grammaire hébraïque provenante de Yemen. Texte arabe. 8. 39 S. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*. m. 4.50.

Paul (Herm.) Grundriss der germanischen Philologie, unter Mitwirkg. von K. v. Amira, W. Arndt, O. Behaghel, etc., hrsg. 1. Bd. Begriff u. Geschichte der german. Philologie.—Methodenlehre.—Schriftkunde.—Sprachgeschichte.—Mythologie. 6. Lfg. gr. 8. xviii, u. S. 1024-1138, m. 1 Runentaf. u. 1 Karte. Strassburg i-E., *K. J. Trübners Verl.* m. 2. (1. Bd. kplt. m. 18; geb. in Halbfz. m. 21.)

Persson (Per.) Studien zur Lehre v. der Wurzelweiterung und Wurzelvariation. gr. 8. vi, 294 S. Upsala, *Akadem. Buchh.* m. 8.80.

Pizzi (Italo). Antologia firdusiana. 2a edizione. gr. 8. xix, 492 S. Leipzig, *W. Gerhard*. m. 12; auf Velinpap. m. 15; Liebhaber-Ausg. m. 20; geb. in Pergament, m. 30.

Plüss (Thdr.) Sophokles' Elektra. Eine Auslegg. gr. 8. viii, 139 S. m. 1 Tab. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 3.

Radloff (W.) Das Kudatku Bilik d. Jusuf Chass-Hadschib aus Bälasagun. 1. Thl. Der Text, in Transscription hrsg. Imp.-4. xciii, 252 S. m. 2 Taf. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* m. 13.15.

Regel (W.) Analecta Byzantino-Russica. Lex.-8. cliv, 143 S. m. 4 photolith. Taf. St. Petersburg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* m. 7.

Sallusti Crispi (C.) Historiarum reliquiae. Ed. Bertoldus Maurenbrecher. Fasc. I. Prolegomena. gr. 8. 83 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken german. Dialekte. Herausg. von. Wilh. Braune. VI. gr. 8. Halle a-S., *M. Niemeyer*. m. 2. Inhalt: Altsächsische Grammatik v. O. Behaghel u. J. H. Gallée, 1. Hälfte: Laut- u. Flexionslehre, bearb. v. J. H. Gallée. x, 116 S.

Schwabe (Ludw.) Geschichte der archäologischen Sammlung der Universität Tübingen. 4. 41 S. Tübingen, *F. Fues*. m. 1.80.

Studien, Berliner, f. classische Philologie u. Archäologie. 12. Bd., 2. u. 3. Hft. gr. 8. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.* Einzelpr. m. 4.50 (12. Bd. kplt. m. 10.80). Inhalt: 2. Das Hannibalische Truppenverzeichnis bei Livius (XXI, C. 22). Von Prof. E. v. Stein. 37 S. m. 1.50.—3. Zenonis Citiensis de rebus physicis doctrinae fundamentum ex adiectis fragmentis constituit Karl Troost. 87 S. m. 3.

Studien, dasselbe. 13. Bd., 1. u. 2. Hft. gr. 8. Ebd. Einzelpr. m. 6.40.
 Inhalt: 1. Die Erkenntnislehre Philos v. Alexandria. Von Max Freudenthal.
 78 S. m. 2.—2. Die Eiche in alter u. neuer Zeit, v. Dr. Paul Wagler. 2. Tl.
 128 S. m. 4.

Sprachproben, altenglische, nebst e. Wörterbuche, hrsg. v. Ed. Mätzner.
 2. Bd. Wörterbuch. 11. Lfg. Lex.-8. 3. Abth. S. 121–304. Berlin, *Weid-*
mann. m. 8. (I–II, 10. m. 72.80.)

Stadelmann (F.) Erziehung u. Unterricht bei den Griechen u. Römern.
 gr. 8. 217 S. Triest, *F. H. Schimpff*. m. 3.50.

Studien, Prager philologische. Mit Unterstützg. d. k. k. Unterrichtsminis-
 teriums hrsg. v. Prof. Otto Keller. 3. Hft. gr. 8. Prag, *H. Dominicus*. m. 1.40.
 (1–3 m. 3.50.) Inhalt: Ant. Ludewig, quomodo Plinius maior, Seneca philo-
 sophos, Curtius Rufus, Quintilianus, Cornelius Tacitus, Plinius minor particula
quidem usi sint. Fasc. I. 76 S.

Texte, irische, m. Übersetzungen u. Wörterbuch. Hrsg. v. Wh. Stokes u.
 E. Windisch. 3. Serie. 1. Hft. gr. 8. iii, 283 S. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*. m. 8.
 (I–III, 1. m. 43.)

Vollers (K.) Lehrbuch der ägypto-arabischen Umgangssprache, m. Übungen
 u. e. Glossar. 8. xi, 231 S. Kairo, 1890. Leipzig, *Köhlers Antiquarium*.
 m. 6; geb. m. 6.50.

Wendland (Paul). Neu entdeckte Fragmente Philos, nebst e. Untersuchg.
 üb. die ursprüngl. Gestalt der Schrift de sacrificiis Abelis et Caini. gr. 8. xi,
 152 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. m. 5.

ITALIAN.

Aristotele. La costituzione degli Ateniesi. Testo greco, versione italiana.
 Introduzione e note per cura di C. Ferrini. Milano. 8vo, pagine 160. 3.50.

— La costituzione di Atene, tradotta da C. G. Zuretti. Torino. 8vo,
 p. 88. 2.

Bellezza (P.) Dei fonti e dell' autorità storica di C. Crispo Sallustio. Mi-
 lano. 16mo, p. 192. 2.50.

Biblioteca delle tradizioni popolari siciliane, per cura di G. Pitré. Vol. I:
 Canti popolari, raccolta illustrata. 2a ediz. Palermo. 16mo, p. 469. Vol.
 II, 16mo, p. 487 con p. 15 di musica. I due volumi inseparabili. 10.

Galbo (Joakim). De personarum in Virgilii Aeneide natura et moribus.
 Palermo. 8vo, p. 128. 3.50.

Laudi del Piemonte raccolte e pubblicate da F. Gabotto e D. Orsi. Vol. I.
 Bologna. 16mo, p. 144. 4.50.

Linati-Delgado (F.) Nuovo Dizionario spagnuolo-italiano e italiano-spag-
 nuolo. Due volumi. Milano. 8vo. 18.

Rinaldi (B.). Novissima cretomazia italiana. 10a ediz. Milano. Due
 vol. 8vo. 6. Vol. I. Prose. p. 656. 4. Vol. II. Poesia e prospetto
 didattico-storico. p. 248. 2.

Roberti (G.) La eloquenza greca. Vol. I. Pericle. Lisia. Isocrate. Torino.
 16mo, p. 309. 4.

Terenzio. Gli Adelphoe, con introduzione e commenti di Ett. Stampini.
 Torino. 8vo, p. 269. 3.50.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Aristotle's ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ, edd. G. Kaibel et U. de Wilamowitz-Möllendorff. Berolini apud *Weidmannos*, MDCCCXCI. 1 m. 80 pf.

Bauer (Adolf). Literarische u. historische Forschungen zu Aristoteles ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ. München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1891.

Buchheim (C. A.) Balladen u. Romanzen, selected and arranged, with notes and literary introduction. (Golden Treasury Series.) New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. \$1.

Caesar, Gallic War. Book I. Edited for the use of schools by Arthur S. Walpole. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. (Through Cushing & Co., Balto.)

Caesaris (C. Iulii) Commentarii de Bello Gallico, herausg. v. Ignaz Prammer. 4te Aufl. vermehrt von einem Anhang: Das römische Kriegswesen in Cäsar's gallischen Kämpfen von E. Kahnke. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1891. 1 m.

Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum, including the newly discovered poems of Herodas. Ed. by F. G. Kenyon, with autotype facsimiles of MSS. British Museum, 1891.

Colorado College Studies (Second Annual Publication). Colorado Springs, Col., 1891.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum Editum consilio et impensis Academiae litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis.

Vol. XX. Fausti Reiensis et Ruricii Opera ex rec. Augusti Engelbrecht.

Vol. XXV. S. Aureli Augustini Operum sectionis VI, pars 1. Ex rec. Iosephi Zycha. Vienna and Prague, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1891.

Culex carmen Vergilio ascriptum. Rec. et enarravit Fridericus Leo. Accedit Copa elegia. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1891. 3 m.

Curtius (Ernst). Die Stadtgeschichte Athen. Mit einer Uebersicht der Schriftquellen zur Topographie von Athen, von A. Milchoefer. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1891. 16 m.

Demosthenes. Ausgewählte Reden. Erkl. von Anton Westermann. 1stes Bdchen, 9. verb. Aufl. besorgt von Emil Rosenberg. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1891. 2 m. 25 pf.

— Ausgewählte Reden. Für den Schulgebr., herausg. von Karl Wotke. 3tte verm. Aufl. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky*, 1891. geb. 55 kr.

Dictionnaire général de la langue française, par Adolphe Hatzfeld et Arsène Darmesteter avec le concours de M. Antoine Thomas. 5 Fasc. Paris, *Ch. Delagrave*. 1 fr.

Dyer (Louis). *Studies of the Gods in Greece at certain Sanctuaries recently excavated.* London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. 8s. 6d.

Euripides. *Ausgewählte Tragödien.* Erstes Bdchen. *Die Bakchen.* 3. Aufl. Erkl. von Ewald Bruhn. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1891. 1 m. 50 pf.

— Hippolytos. Griechisch u. Deutsch von Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1891. 8m.

— Iphigenia at Aulis. Ed. with introduction and critical and explanatory notes by E. B. England. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. \$1.75.

Fac-similés de manuscrits grecs d'Espagne gravés d'après les photographies de Charles Graux avec transcriptions et notices par M. Albert Martin. Paris, *Hachette et Cie.*

Freudenthal (Max). *Die Erkenntnislehre Philos von Alexandria.* Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1891. 2 m. 50 pf.

Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea. Edited with an introduction and notes by Waterman T. Hewett. Boston, *D. C. Heath*, 1891.

Gomperz (Th.) *Die Schrift vom Staatswesen der Athener.* Eine Streitschrift. Wien, *Alfred Holder*, 1891.

Goodwin (W. W.) *The Present and Future of Harvard College.* (Phi Beta Kappa Address.) Boston, *Ginn & Co.* 30 cts.

Graves (Frank P.) *The Burial Customs of the Ancient Greeks.* (M. A. Thesis, Columbia College.) Brooklyn, *Roche & Hawkins*, 1891.

Griechische Lyriker in Auswahl. für den Schulgebr. herausg. von Alfred Biese. I Teil: Text. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1891. geh. 75 pf.

HPQNΔOY MIMIAMBOL. Herondas. A first recension by W. G. Rutherford. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. 60 cts.

Hawthorne (Julian) and Lemmon (Leonard). *American Literature.* An elementary textbook for use in high schools and academies. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1891. \$1.25.

Homer. *Odyssey.* Books VII-XII. With introduction, notes and table of Homeric forms by W. W. Merry. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891.

Horati (Q.) *Flacci Sermonum et Epistolarum libri.* Satiren u. Epistelen des Horaz. Mit Anmerkungen von Lucian Müller. 1. Theil. Satiren. Wien, *F. Tempsky.* Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1891.

Horatius (Q.) *Flaccus.* Rec. Guillelmus Mewes. Vol. Alterum. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1891. 1 m. 80 pf.

Hübner (Emil). *The Roman Inscriptions of Deva (Chester).* Reprinted from the *Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society*, 1888-9. 1890.

Hultsch (Fr.) *Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Polybios.* Ein Beitrag zur Syntax der gemeingriechischen Sprache. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*, 1891.

La Roche (J.) *Commentar zu Homers Odyssee.* 1 Heft, Gesang I-VI. Wien, *F. Tempsky.* Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1891. geh. 1 m.

Klüh (John M.) *The Story of the Childhood of the Lord Jesus the Savior.* Printed with an alphabet of 45 letters. Chicago, *J. M. Klüh*, 1892. 75 cts.

Jameson (J. Franklin). The History of Historical Writing in America. Boston and New York, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1891.

Johnston (Richard Malcolm). Studies Literary and Social. (First Series.) Indianapolis, *The Bowen-Merrill Co.*, 1891. \$1.25.

Langley (S. P.) Experiments in Aerodynamics. Washington, *Smithsonian Institution*.

Lees (J. T.) The *δικανικὸς λόγος* in Euripides. Diss. J. H. U.

Mayhew (A. L.) Synopsis of Old English Phonology. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. 8s. 6d.

Molee (Elias B.) Nu English. A proposed simplified English language for home use and for international commerce and travel. *The Author*, Beery Block, Room 501, Minneapolis, Minn. 25 cts.

Müller (H. C.) Historische Grammatik der hellenischen Sprache. Erster Band. Grammatik. Leiden, *E. J. Brill*, 1891.

Murray (A. T.) On Parody and Paratragedia in Aristophanes. J. H. U. Diss. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1891.

Philological Society's English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Ed. by James A. H. Murray. Vol. III, Part I, E-EVERY, by Henry Bradley. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. \$3.25.

Plautus, The Captivi. With introduction and notes by A. R. S. Hallidie. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. 90 cts.

Pope (G. U.) First Lessons in Tamil, or an introduction to the common dialect of that language. Fifth ed. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. 7s. 6d.

Proceedings of the American Oriental Society at Boston and Cambridge, May 15-16, 1891.

Quintiliani (M. Fabi) Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus. A revised text, with introductory essay, critical and explanatory notes, and a facsimile of the Harleian MS, by W. Peterson. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891.

Radford (R. S.) A Treatise on Temporal and Modal Significance in the Latin Indirect Discourse. (Dr. Diss., Univ. of Virginia.) Charlottesville, Va., *James Blakey*, 1891.

Radermacher (Lud.). Observationes in Euripidem Miscellae. (Diss.) Bonnae, *Typis Caroli Georgii*, 1891.

Sallustius (C.) Crispus. Bellum Catilinae, Bellum Iugurthinum u. Reden u. Briefe aus den Historien zum Schulgebr. herausg. von August Scheindler. Zweite Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1891. 1 m.

Shelley. A Defense of Poetry. Edited with introduction and notes by A. S. Cook. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1891.

Snider (Denton J.) Homer in Chios. An Epopee. St. Louis, *Sigma Publishing Co.*, 1891.

Sophocles, The Antigone of. With an introduction, notes, and appendix for the use of students in colleges, by Milton W. Humphreys. New York, *Harper & Brothers*, 1891.

Sophokles' Elektra. Für den Schulgebr. herausg. von Friedrich Schubert. 2te verb. Aufl. Wien u. Prag, *F. Tempsky*, 1891. geh. 36 kr.

Speyer (J. S.) *Observationes et emendationes scrips.* J. S. S. Groningae, *J. B. Wolters*, 1891.

Stern (E. von). *Das hannibalische Truppenverzeichnis bei Livius.* Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1891. 1 m. 50 pf.

Stowasser. *Eine zweite Reihe dunkle Wörter.* Wien, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1891.

Tacitus, *The Annals of.* Edited with introduction and notes by Henry Furneaux. Vol. II, Bks. XI-XVI. With a map. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. (Through Cushing & Co. Balto.) \$4.50.

Tenth Annual Report of the Dante Society. Cambridge (U. S.), *John Wilson & Sons*, 1891.

Thucydides. Book II. Edited by E. C. Marchant. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891. (Through Cushing & Co., Balto.) 90 cts.

ΘΟΥΚΥΔΙΔΟΥ ΕΒΔΟΜΗ. *The Seventh Book of Thucydides.* The text newly revised and explained, with introduction, summaries, maps and indexes, by H. A. Holden. Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1891.

Zenonis Citiensis de rebus physicis doctrinae fundamentum ex adjectis fragmentis constituit. Karl Troost. Berlin, *S. Calvary & Co.*, 1891. 3 m.

Wagner (Richard). *Der Gebrauch des imperativen Infinitivs im Griechischen.* Wissenschaftlich Beilage zum Programm des Fridericianum zu Schwerin i.-M. 1891.

Woodruff (F. E.) *Exercises in Greek Prose Composition.* Based upon the *Anabasis*, Bks. I-III. Boston and New York, *Leach, Shewell & Sanborn*, 1891.

Young (Clarence H.) *Erchia, a deme of Attica.* (Columbia Coll. Diss.) New York, *E. & J. B. Young*, 1891.